

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XXV, No. 97

JANUARY 1949

JOHN FOXE AND *THE CONFLICT OF CONSCIENCE*

By LESLIE MAHIN OLIVER

THE *Acts and Monuments* of John Foxe, popularly known as the Book of Martyrs, was one of the most influential books in England during the first century after its appearance. It went through eight large editions in English; it was ordered to be kept for the use of the public in cathedral churches; and bishops, deans, and other church dignitaries were required to own copies.¹ The influence of the book upon the thought and action of the time has never been fully assessed. It has been known, however, that material from the book was used in the plays *Sir Thomas More*,² *Thomas Lord Cromwell*,³ *Henry VIII*,⁴ *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*,⁵ and *The Duchess of Suffolk*.⁶ A recently published article establishes that Samuel Rowley drew upon Foxe for the new scene he wrote for Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*.⁷ It can be proved, also, that Foxe's influence was present in the late morality play, *The Conflict of Conscience*, by Nathaniel Woodes.

The Conflict of Conscience, like the earlier *New Custom*, is a morality play with a strong Reformation bias.⁸ Unlike most moralities, it deals with an historical personage. Francis Spiera or Spira, an Italian gentleman of property, is said to have been a devout Protestant who was forced by

¹ *A Booke of Certain Canons . . . of the Church of England . . . 1571* (London: John Day, 1571), sig. A3^v-B1.

² C. F. Tucker-Brooke, *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (Oxford, 1908), p. liv.

³ Edmund Malone, *Supplement to the Edition of Shakespeare's Plays Published in 1778 by Samuel Johnson and George Steevens* (London, 1780), ii. 374 n.

⁴ W. G. Boswell-Stone, *Shakespeare's Holinshed* (London, 1896), pp. 494 ff., 455 n., 471, 472 n., 473, 478, 481.

⁵ R. G. Martin, 'The Source of Heywood's *If You Know Not Me*', *M.L.N.*, xxxix (1924), 220-2.

⁶ Thomas Drue, *The Duchess of Suffolk* (London, 1631).

⁷ L. M. Oliver, 'Rowley, Foxe, and the *Faustus* Additions', *M.L.N.*, lx (1945), 391-4.

⁸ An excellent new Commedie, | Intituled: | The Conflict of Conscience. | CONTAYNINGE, | The most lamentable Hystorie, of the des-peration of Frauncis Spera, who forsooke | the trueth of Gods [sic] Gospell, for feare | of the losse of life and worldly goodes. | Compiled, by Nathaniell | Woodes. Minister, in Norwich | . . . | AT LONDON | Printed, | by Richarde Bradocke | dwellinge in Aldermanburie, a little aboue the | Conduict. Anno 1581. |

threats of punishment and loss of property to abjure his beliefs and return to Catholicism. He died in 1548, under circumstances not clearly understood, but evidently suffering from remorse. The incident appears to have been well known in England. Spiera is mentioned twice in Foxe, both times as one familiarly known.¹ A book by Matteo Gribaldi and others on the subject² was translated by Edward Aglionby as *A Notable and Marvelous Epistle*, and went through two editions, in 1550 and 1570.³ It is the story of Spiera's apostasy that the play undertakes to tell.

The Conflict of Conscience was published in two distinct issues in 1581. There is no evidence to support a theory that it was written long before it was published, although by that date this kind of morality was no longer a common theatrical type. Its closest literary counterpart is the dramatic work of Bale. Little is known of the author, Nathaniel Woodes, beyond what is given on the title-page. One of that name is listed as taking his B.A. at Corpus Christi, Cambridge, in 1570-1, and his M.A. in 1574.⁴ The play is, I should judge, the product of a reasonably mature mind; it is inordinately dull and clumsy, but by no means callow. The author's name, however, is a common one; possibly he is not the Woodes mentioned in Cooper. Possibly also Woodes was not the original author, but merely the editor or reviser of an earlier play. I see no reason to doubt that the play was actually performed, perhaps at Norwich. At any rate, there is reason to believe that the play, at least in its present form, does not antedate the first English edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.

The two issues of the play, though printed in the same year, differ in several important ways.⁵ The first issue names Francis Spiera on the title-page and in the prologue, and in the last scene he is reported to have hanged himself. In the second issue the name of Spiera does not appear; and the ending of the story has been changed completely:

Philologus, that would haue hangde himselfe with coard,

¹ John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. Josiah Pratt and John Stoughton, London, n.d., vii. 219; viii. 667.

² British Museum, *Catalogue of Printed Books*, 1886, under C. S. Curio: F. Spierae, qui quod suspectam semel Evangelice veritatis professionem abnegasset damnassetque in horridam incidit desperationem historia, a quatuor summis viris [C. S. Curio, M. Gribaldus, Henricus [Scrimzeor] Scotus, and S. Geloris] . . . conscripta: cum praefationibus Caelii S. C. et J. Calvini & P. Vergerii Apologia . . . a cessit quoque M. Borrhai, de usu quem Spierae tum exemplum tum doctrina afferat iudicium [Geneva? 1550?] 80.

³ * A notable a[nd] | maruailous epi-|stle of the famous Doctor, Ma-[thewe] Gribalde, professor of the | law, in the vniuersitie of Padua: concer[n]ing the terrible iudgement of god, | vpon hym that for feare of men, | denyeth Christ and the kno-|wen veritie: wyth a Pre-|face of Doctor Cal-|uine. Translated | out of Latin | intoo En-|glish, by | E. A. | Luke. xii. | . . . | Anno. 1550. in August. | [All in black letter.] [From a microfilm of the Bodleian copy.]

⁴ Cooper, *Athenae Cantabrigienses*.

⁵ For a definitive discussion of this bibliographical problem, see William A. Jackson, 'The Conflict of Conscience', *T.L.S.*, 7 September 1933, p. 592.

Is nowe conuerted vnto God, with manie bitter teares . . .
And being conuerted, left his lyfe.

In most other respects the two issues are the same. Spiera appears in both under the pseudonym of Philologus.

Celesta Wine in 1935 published a detailed account of the play's relationship to its sources, establishing clearly that the author's major source was Edward Aglionby's translation of Gribaldi, mentioned above.¹ Miss Wine has been at great pains to point out, also, the minor contributing influences, the Bible, the Golden Legend, proverbs, and anti-Catholic literature. Of the trial scene in Act IV she says only that it seems 'to have been developed from hints in *A Notable and Marvelous Epistle*'. Aglionby's book, however, merely announces that Spiera was 'summoned tappeare at Venys before the Legate of y^e chief Bysshop',² and says no more of the trial. Miss Wine does not mention Foxe.

The play follows the story of Spiera only in a very general way. The whole, in so far as it is localized, is thoroughly British, and one character speaks with what is obviously intended to be a Scottish accent. The climax of the plot comes in the fourth act, in which Philologus comes before a Cardinal to be examined for heresy. His trial, occupying most of the act, is, in all probability, a composite of many such trials, or 'examinations', as they had been reported by Foxe in the *Acts and Monuments*.

The examinations in Foxe do not all follow the same pattern. Some of them, evidently, were written down by clerks as they took place—although, since no shorthand system was then in use, such records could not be very accurate. More often, however, the report in Foxe was written from memory by the prisoner himself. In such a report, the prisoner can be expected to have the best of every argument. Depending on the learning and experience of the accused and his examiners, the trials may be—as were those of Ridley and Bradford—subtle and scholarly disputations. Or if the prisoner was unlearned, the whole examination might be very simple indeed, and confined to the most obvious points of doctrine. Most of the persons suspected of heresy, however, were able to argue for their beliefs, if we may trust Foxe at all. And certainly part of the psychology of the 'heretic' is a willingness to argue. Normally they were imprisoned with other sufferers for the same cause. During the weeks and months that usually passed before the trials, arguments to support their beliefs would have been thrashed out in group discussions. Some of these prison scenes have been described by Foxe, and one of them was made the subject of a woodcut.³

Interchange of ideas in prison must also account in part, I believe, for

¹ Celesta Wine, 'Nathaniel Woodes' *Conflict of Conscience*, *P.M.L.A.* 1 (1935), 661-8.

² Sig. A7.

³ Foxe, vi. 610; vii. 356; for the woodcut, see ed. 1610, sig. 712.

the oddly repetitious character of some of the examinations in Foxe. If many prisoners drew upon the common stock of argumentative material, they would tend to make about the same answers to the same questions. Some of the similarity, of course, may have come about when the reports were written afterwards, again in prison with a group of fellow sufferers. It is also possible, though there is no proof of it, that Foxe may have felt himself justified in editing some of the reports, and in putting his own arguments into the mouths of the disputants. Such a practice probably would not have been considered particularly reprehensible, and unless there had been a full official record of the trial concerned, it would have been very hard to detect. This is one of the crimes of which Robert Parsons the Jesuit accused Foxe.¹

The examination in *The Conflict of Conscience* is modelled after no particular trial in Foxe, but appears to be a simplification of a typical trial. Only two points of doctrine are discussed—the supremacy of the Pope and the real presence in the sacrament; the arguments advanced on these subjects are about the simplest and most obvious to be found in Foxe. After a comparatively small amount of questioning, the examiners turn to a combination of threats and cajolery. Such methods were quite commonly employed in fact. Then Woodes departs from reality and introduces the allegorical *Mirror of Sensual Suggestion*; Philologus is overcome and agrees to recant. It is in the details of the examination, rather than in its general structure, that we find the evidence of Foxe's influence:

Sig. Er^v. A Cardinal as chief examiner.

Commonly Cardinals left the examination of heretics to the lower orders of churchmen, but Wolsey took an active part in it, and his manner in the courtroom as reported in Foxe is not unlike that of the Cardinal in the play.²

Sig. Er^v.

Bring forth that Heretike,

Which doth thus disturb our religion Catholicke.

Such begging of the question—calling the accused a heretic at the very beginning of the trial intended to determine whether or not he is guilty of heresy—is so common in Foxe that it scarcely requires citation. A similar fallacy occurs in about three out of five of the trials Foxe reports. Philpot's and Bland's first examinations are good examples.³

¹ *A Treatise of Three Conversions of England* [St. Omer], 1603-4, iii, sig. Q7-R1^v. Thomas Fuller may have had this work in mind when he made this comment: 'I am not ignorant that of late great disgrace hath been thrown on that author [Foxe], and his worthy work, chiefly because sometimes he makes Popish Doctors, well known to be rich in learning, to reason very poorly, and the best Fencers of their Schools worsted and put out of their play by some country poore Protestants. But let the cavillers hereat know, that it is a great matter to have the oddes of the weapon, Gods word on their side; not to say anything of supernaturall assistance given them.' (*Holy State*, sig. Rr3^v.)

² Foxe, iv. 622; v. 416 ff.

³ vii. 292, 606 f.

Sig. E2. Cardinal:

Where haue you ben from me so long absent,
I appoynted to haue ben here three howres ago,
In my consistory to haue set in iudgement.

Bonner, Bishop of London, to Philpot:

Sirrah, come hither. How chance you come no sooner? Is it well done of you to make master chancellor and me to tarry for you this hour? By the faith of my body, half an hour before mass, and half an hour even at mass, looking for your coming.¹

Sig. E2. Art thou so expert in Gods lawes and word,
That no man may learne thee?

This same question, varying somewhat in form but never in purpose, is put to many of the prisoners in Foxe. It was put to Philpot thus: 'What! Do you think yourself better learned than so many notable learned men as be here?'²

Sig. E2. But this is the nature of euery Scismatike:
Be his errors neuer so false Doctrine,
He will say, by Gods word, he dare it examine.

This statement by the Cardinal is literally true; almost every prisoner whose examination is reported in Foxe claimed to base his beliefs directly on Scripture, and demanded to be tried in accordance with the Word. John Roger, pressed to accept a point of doctrine, replies, 'I will find it first in the Scripture, and see it tried thereby'.³ Of course the examiners made sarcastic references to the 'stubbornness' of the 'heretics'.⁴

Sig. E2^v. How saist thou Philologus?
Haue I authoritie to call the me before?

Bonner:

'How say you, master Doctor Cole? May I not proceed against him by the law, for that he hath done in my diocese?'⁵

'How say you, Master Doctor; do you not know that I am Legatus de latere, and that I am able to dispense in all matters concerning religion within this realm, as much as the pope may?'⁶

Sig. E2^v. The Cardinal in the play links the preceding point with the question of the pope's supremacy, and thus brings up the first doctrinal point. Whether or not the Pope was the true head of the Church was, of course, often argued in heresy trials, but the arguments were usually not good dramatic material. Philologus's argument comes from none of the examinations in Foxe; he maintains that Peter never visited Rome; that

¹ vii. 638.

² vii. 618; see also 639, 653, 668; viii. 332, 350, 433, 476, 477, 542, 544.

³ vi. 595; see also vii. 608; viii. 543.

⁴ vii. 608 f., 627; viii. 544.

⁵ vii. 614 f.

⁶ v. 417.

Peter was not the chief of the disciples; and that the Pope violated Christ's teaching that the servant should not be above the master. Christ refused to be king, but the Pope set himself above kings. These arguments are in Foxe, not in the examinations, but in the Exordium at the beginning of the first book. They are Foxe's own arguments.¹

Sig. E3. But let him go forwarde and vtter his conscience.

Lord Chandos:

'I pray you, my lord, let him speak his mind.'²

Sig. E3. Say on thou Heretike of the holy sacrament,
Of the body and bloud of Christ, what is thine opinion?

Thus opens the second doctrinal question, probably the most frequently argued point in all the history of religious polemics. This vexed and perilous question is argued again and again, with varying degrees of learning and sophistry, throughout the pages of Foxe. No matter how simple and unlearned the prisoner might be, the examiners had a way of putting this question to him. Under Mary, when heresy trials were frequent, the examiners learned by experience that it was not enough to make the prisoner admit the 'real presence'. Those words were too slippery. The key question was this: After the consecration, does any bread and wine remain?³ Unless the prisoner said no without qualification, he was a heretic. So in the play, the examiners sit quietly and listen to Philologus on the sacrament. He speaks 24 lines of safe generalities, and then—

Sig. E3^v. That Christ feedes our soules as the bread doth our body.

Card:

Ah thou foul Heretike, is there bread in the Sacrament?

Where is Christes body then which he did us giue?

There are several ways to make the next move, depending on the learning and the subtlety of the contestants. The Cardinal makes an orthodox opening:

In what sence sayd Christ, *Hoc est Corpus meum*?

Philologus makes the simplest and most direct of returns, which requires only a knowledge of scripture on his part:

Euen in the same sence that he sayd before:

Vos estis sall terrae, vos estis Lux mundi:

Ego sum ostium: and a hundreth such more . . .

Were Christes disciples into salt transformed

When he sayd: ye are the salt of the earth . . .?

¹ i. 26–60, especially 47 f.

² vii. 630; see also viii. 348.

³ iii. 328, 330.

This argument is used again and again in Foxe, usually by the simpler and less learned of the prisoners.¹

Finding Philologus able to hold his own in argument, the Cardinal threatens him with imprisonment:

Sig. E4. Haue him hence to prison and keepe him full sure:
I will make him set by my friendship more store.

The examinations were usually broken into several sessions, sometimes many days apart, and of course between sessions the accused was in prison. But we find in Foxe that the examiner sometimes gave explicit directions that the prisoner be kept 'full sure'—less out of fear that he would escape, it seems, than out of hope that the rigorous confinement, stocks and irons, might make him change his mind.

'Have this fellow hence, and carry him to the King's Bench, and charge the keeper he be straitly kept.'²

Hypocrisy, meanwhile, pretends friendship for the prisoner:

Sig. E4^v. Good Maister Philologus, I pittie your case,
To see you so foolysh, your selfe to vndoo:
I durst yet promys to purchase you grace,
If you would (at length) your errorrs forgoe:
Therefore, I pray you, be not your owne foe.

Such a proffer of friendship was a common method of breaking down the resistance of the prisoner, as I doubt not it still is wherever police try to extort a confession from a suspect. According to Foxe, Bonner often used this method, alternating with extreme harshness:

'Yet I would you should have as much favor as I can show you, if you will be anything conformable. Therefore play the wise man, and be not singular in your own opinion.'³

Sig. E4^v. Nay, Mayster Hypocrisie, you spend tyme in vaine,
To reason with him, he will not be remooued.

'It is but folly to reason any more with him.'⁴

Sig. E4^v. Phil: I humbly beseeche you of Christian charitie,
You seeke not of purpose my blood for to spill.

The suggestion that the examiners are seeking the blood of the prisoner is not uncommon in Foxe. Some prisoners make the accusation boldly; others, like Philologus, phrase it more humbly.⁵

¹ vi. 725; vii. 106, 335, 737; viii. 244, 308, 587.

² vi. 683; see also 726; vii. 99, 350, 394, 609, 610, 644; viii. 352, 408, 544.

³ vii. 620; see also 611.

⁴ vii. 623; see also 666.

⁵ vii. 350; viii. 339, 507, 585.

Sig. Fr^v-2. I beseeche your Lordship euen from the hart roote,
 That you would vouchsafe for my contentation
 To approue vnto mee by Gods holy booke
 Some one of the questions of our disputation:
 For I will heere you with hartes delectation:
 Because I would gladly to your doctrine consent
 If that I could so my conscience content.

Such offers to be taught by the Scriptures, doubtless as sincere as this one seems, were sometimes made by the prisoners in Foxe.¹ A few may have courted and welcomed martyrdom, but most of them would have been glad to escape it, if they could have satisfied their consciences.

Sig. E3^v. For as the bread is of many Cornells compounded,
 And the Wine from the Luce of many Graps do descend . . .

This simile was employed by John Frith:

For in that it is made one bread of many corns, it is called our body, which, being diuers and many members, are associated and gathered together into one fellowship or body. Likewise of the wine, which is gathered of many clusters of grapes, and is made into one liquor.²

Sig. E3^v. So we . . . should cease to contend:
 Least by our contention the Church we offend.

But how much were it better, in my opinion, if that by a common consent of either party, they would come to this point: that every man being contented with his own opinion, we should all simply agree upon the presence of Christ, that, as touching the manner of his presence, even as though all manner of disputation should cease for a time, and so, by little and little, all controversies turned to truce and quietness; until that time should breed more love and charity amongst men, or that love and charity should find a remedy for these controversies.³

Sig. F1. The Cardinal orders the prisoner's property seized:
 That *Careful Prouision* should goe, I thinke best,
 Into the towne, and there, assistance craue,
 His House for to enter, and his Goods for me saue:
 Least, when his wife know, that they be confiscate,
 Into other mens keepyng, the same she doth dissipate.

Such a seizure was not a common ingredient of heresy trials. But churchmen suspected of heresy were commonly dispossessed of their livings, and their effects were sometimes searched for incriminating evidence:

¹ vii. 30, 102, 615, 668; viii. 540.

² v. 12.

³ v. 11 (first edition only).

To declare here with what cruelty the officers searched his house for bills and books, how cruelly and shamefully they handled his wife . . . it were too long to write.¹

Sig. F2^v. He will roste a Fagot, or els he me deceiue.

I have not found the exact phrase 'roast a faggot' in Foxe, but 'fry a faggot' occurs twice at least. It was used, for instance, by Bishop Hooper, the first of the Marian martyrs.²

Sig. F4^v. It is now high dinner time my stomack doth say:
And I will not lose one meale of my diet,
Though thereon did hang an hundred mens quiet.

With these words one came for them to dinner in all haste. 'I am sorry, I would fain hear more of this talk; but we shall have another day well enough.'³

Sig. F4^v. If thou wilt be ruled by thy friendes that be heere,
Thou shalt abound in wealth and prosperitie:
And in the Countrie chiefe rule thou shalt beare,
And a hundred pounds more thou shalt haue in the yeere.

The offer of monetary rewards or professional advancement was a common procedure in dealing with those accused of heresy. The examiners were usually sincerely anxious that the accused should turn rather than burn. Offers were made to Philpot, Hooper, Rowland Taylor, and William Hunter, among others;⁴ no doubt the method was frequently successful, but men who yielded to such persuasion would have small place in Foxe's book.

Sig. G1. Philologus is overcome and decides to recant. Several of Foxe's martyrs recanted at some point in their careers; Cranmer is the most distinguished example.⁵ Philologus's recantation is not modelled upon any of these.

All in all, there are sufficient points of similarity between the examination in the play and those in Foxe to justify the conclusion that the playwright was familiar with Foxe. We may, of course, prefer to believe that he had at his disposal manuscripts and records similar to those Foxe collected so laboriously; but that is highly improbable. Or we may think that the playwright may himself have witnessed the trials he imitated; that is possible, unless we insist that our author is the Nathaniel Woodes listed in Cooper; he was only about nine years old when Mary died. But no one individual, and certainly no one with Protestant sympathies, is likely to have been able to produce, out of his own experience, the composite trial we have in the play. The sources of that trial are literary; and they are, I believe, in Foxe.

¹ v. 22.

² vi. 649; see also viii. 538.

³ viii. 362.

⁴ vi. 650, 696, 727; vii. 612; viii. 216 f.

⁵ viii. 80; see also v. 418.

THE VERY POMPE OF THE DIVELL—POPULAR AND FOLK ELEMENTS IN ELIZABETHAN AND JACOBEOAN DRAMA

By DOUGLAS HEWITT

'... popular Stage-plays (the very Pompes of the Divell which we renounce in Baptisme, if we beleewe the fathers) are sinfull, heathenish, lewde, ungodly Spectacles, and most pernicious Corruptions.' WILLIAM PRYNNE, *Histriomastix* (London, 1633).

I

CONSIDERABLE attention has been given during the last twenty years to the influence of folk-plays and other ceremonies on the drama in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the extent to which relics of these folk customs remain in dramatic works up to that time. Their significance as one of the sources of the plays of the Elizabethan age has been stressed, in opposition to Sir E. K. Chambers's judgement that: 'Modern drama arose, by a fairly well defined line of evolution, from a three-fold source, the ecclesiastical liturgy, the farce of the mimes, the classical revivals of humanism. Folk drama contributed but the tiniest rill to the mighty stream.'¹

Miss Spens, for example, has noted the close parallel between the curious scene in *As You Like It*, where Jaques makes the foresters dance with horns on their heads, and the ritual horn-dance—a relic of pagan worship—celebrated annually, up to a late date, at Abbots Bromley.² She has also pointed out³ the resemblance of Sir Toby Belch to the Lord of Misrule who presided over the Twelfth Night celebrations. Miss Welsford has shown⁴ the close connexion between the function of the fool in *King Lear* and in the 'sotties', and Professor Murray has dwelt⁵ on the similarities of theme between *Hamlet* and the Orestes cycle and the origin of both in folk-lore.

Just as Greek tragedy, which originated in the worship of Dionysos, derived part of its force from its religious associations, so Elizabethan

¹ E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage* (Oxford, 1903), i. 182.

² Janet Spens, *Elizabethan Drama* (London, 1922). A similar suggestion is also to be found in R. J. E. Tiddy, *The Mummers' Play* (Oxford, 1923).

³ Janet Spens, *Elizabethan Drama*, and *An Essay on Shakespeare's Relation to Tradition* (Oxford, 1916).

⁴ Enid Welsford, *The Fool* (London, 1935).

⁵ Gilbert Murray, 'Hamlet and Orestes: a Study in Traditional Types', *British Academy Annual Shakespeare Lecture* (1914).

drama,¹ when performed to an audience responsive to the folk ceremonies from which the plays partly sprang, may have made certain appeals which are now lost. Obviously the effect of this appeal to the religious origin could not be as strong in Elizabethan as in Classical Greek drama. The cult of the god of fertility, of whom Dionysos was—with Adonis, Attis, Osiris, Sabazios, Zagreus, and many others—one manifestation, was modified by the religion of the Olympian hierarchy in which he found his place, but it remained a part of the orthodox and living religion. The folk ceremonies, widespread in England during the Middle Ages and until the seventeenth century, were derived from the worship of the same god of fertility, but were not part of the orthodox religion of the country. Some of the old pagan festivals had been converted by the Church to its own purpose, and it seems highly improbable that such remaining ceremonies as the 'carrying out of death' to ensure a good harvest, the morris- and the sword-dances, the Mummers' Play and May-games, could have been seen by any of the participants as fragments of a coherent religious system.

But they had survived. Some had enough hold to survive the onslaughts of the Puritans; and they were, undoubtedly, one source of the drama that matured in the work of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. We must accordingly admit the possibility that the reactions of the Elizabethan audience to Sir Toby Belch or to the mocking of Lear by the Fool were different from ours, and that the effects sought, whether consciously or not, by the dramatist relied upon an audience responsive to these links with the folk ceremonies. In particular, the attitude towards the tragic hero may have been different. The central figure of the pagan cults was the god who died that fertility might come to the land. If a parallel between the tragic hero and this god of the cults was ever suggested or felt, it is clear that the dramatists of Shakespeare's time had more and far different emotional resources at their disposal.

We have, therefore, to discover both how far the Elizabethan audience sensed a connexion between the folk ceremonies and the drama, and whether the ceremonies retained their original significance in greater or less degree for audience and performers, or whether they were mere revels, as unmeaning as the morris- and country-dancing of societies to-day.

Here we must emphasize that this essay considers the Elizabethan drama solely from the point of view indicated in its title.

II

Many writers have demonstrated that the ceremonies survived throughout the British Isles up to the early seventeenth century. Indeed, frag-

¹ By 'Elizabethan' throughout this paper is meant 'Elizabethan and Jacobean', an abbreviation which seems justified by the common description of Shakespeare as an 'Elizabethan dramatist'.

ments of them survived far longer, and isolated examples are found even to-day.¹

Their forms have been described by Sir E. K. Chambers² and Mr. Tiddy³ and further accounts are easily to be found. In general, they were all part of the worship of the god of fertility who was often known as the 'god of the corn'. They were all annual festivals closely connected with the seasons of the year and their effect on the growth of the crops.

The fate of the god was associated, in the normal manner of sympathetic magic, with the cycle of the seasons, so that at harvest his triumph was celebrated, while in Spring his adversary, Winter, was driven out to cleanse the land of evil and sterility. Whitsun pastorals, May-games, morris- and sword-dances were all parts of this cult, while its most developed dramatic form was the Mummers' Play. The St. George of the Mummers' Play, killed by his opponent, usually known as the Turkish Knight, and then revived by the Doctor, 'symbolizes the *renouveau*, the annual death of the year or the fertilization spirit and its annual resurrection in spring'.⁴

Such ceremonies are essentially the expression of an agricultural people; and Elizabethan England, we must remember, was almost entirely agricultural. London itself had much of the character of a country market town and was in no way insulated from these customs. The Paris Garden on Bankside, for example, was used not only for stage plays but also for these festivals, as well as for bear-baiting and the like pastimes.

We need not look farther than the Puritan attackers of the stage to find an awareness of the connexion between the drama and these ceremonies. John Rainolds, in *Th'Overthrow of Stage-Playes* (Middleburg, 1599), puts the trouble succinctly as 'stage-playes in the Universitie, and Maygames in the towne', and it may be noted that Rabbi Zeal-of-the-Land Busy speaks of 'your Stage-players, Rimers, and Morrise-dancers, who have walked hand in hand'. William Prynne's *Histriomastix*, in its defence of linking plays with 'Dancing, Musicke, Apparell, Effeminacy, Lascivious Songs, Laughter, Adultery, Obscene Pictures, Bonfires, New-yeares gifts, Grand Christmasses, Health-drinking, Long haire, Lords-dayes, Dicing', because they are either 'the concomitants of Stage-playes' or 'homogeniall in their genericall nature', may seem a little too indiscriminate for us to draw from it any conclusions as to the precise relationships between any of its parts. Stephen Gosson, in *Playes Confuted in five Actions* (London, c. 1582), is rather more precise. He says: 'these things

¹ To mention but one example, nowhere previously remarked upon, my father informs me that as late as 1895 he watched men with blackened faces dancing on Plough Monday into Cambridge up the Histon Road.

² E. K. Chambers, *The English Folk Play* (Oxford, 1933).

³ R. J. E. Tiddy, *The Mummers' Play* (Oxford, 1923).

⁴ E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage* (Oxford, 1903), i. 218.

which are neither necessary nor beneficial unto men, yet cary in their forehaddes a manyfest print of their first condition, as May-games, Stageplaies, and such like, can not be suffred among Christians without Apostacy because they were suckt from the Devilles teate, to Nurce up Idolatrie.'

In many other writers of the time we find that stage plays, morris-dancing, May-games, Mummings, and 'Bacchanalian Grand-Christmasses'¹ are denounced together as idolatrous and pagan. The Fathers of the Church are cited as forbidding Christians to take part in both Mummings and stage plays because they were both dedicated to idols, and it is explicitly emphasized that all arguments that, though once true, this is no longer so are invalid. Prynne quotes: 'The Councell of Africke, Canon 27, Prohibits Christians to make Feasts or Morrice-daunces, on the Birthdayes of Martyres, because such Feasting, and Dauncing, had their Originall from Gentilisme', and he mentions as pagan customs the decking of houses with green boughs, Mummings, and tumblings. Further, he emphasizes that St. Augustine forbade plays lest they should cause backsliding by making people celebrate heathen rites, and quotes Tertullian and other Fathers on the wickedness of wearing laurel crowns or having bonfires and morris-dances, and St. Chrysostom, who spoke of stage plays as 'the Devills Pompes: the fables of Satan: Demoniacall mysteries: the impure foode of the Devil'.

The Puritan case in this was an easy one; the origin of the drama in the worship of Dionysos-Bacchus and the introduction of plays into Rome to assuage a pestilence by order of the 'Devill-God Iupiter Capitolinus'² were well known. We therefore find such typical pages of denunciation as that of I(ohn) G(reene) in *A Refutation of the Apology for Actors* (London, 1615): 'Now what was offered and consecrated to the honour of the Idoll Gods and Divels, more than Playes? And what filthinesse of Idols should they more avoid then Playes . . .?' Stephen Gosson, in *Playes Confuted in Five Actions*, says similarly: 'Stage Playes . . . were consecrated to the honour of Heathen Gods, and therefore consecrated to idolatrie.'

We must, of course, beware of taking too literally the somewhat figurative language of the Puritan preachers and pamphleteers. Prynne's statement that plays cause us to break the first commandment by 'honouring, applauding, invoking, naming, representing, adjuring, and extolling Pagan Idol-gods, and Goddesses, by the name of God, and in reviving their infernall ceremonies, rites and worship: and in propagating Atheisme and Idolatry' must not be taken as part of a logically reasoned argument that plays support the surviving pagan ceremonies in an attack on Christianity.

Such attacks on the stage do, however, show that the connexion between

¹ Prynne, *Histriomastix*.

² Ibid.

ceremonies and stage plays was taken sufficiently for granted for both to be attacked in the same terms and for the argument to turn backwards and forwards between them without any interruption in the flow of denunciation. Moreover, the terms of 'idolatry' and 'paganism' seem to present themselves with the greatest readiness. It is noteworthy that by the eighteenth century attacks on the stage (no longer all by Puritans) are of a very different kind and in keeping with the 1690 Society for the Reformation of Manners. Once the folk ceremonies had been largely suppressed or had, with the changes in social structure, died out, the 'idoltrous' nature of stage plays seems forgotten. Emphasis now is on their 'luscious song',¹ their 'Moving the Passions',² their 'Prophane and Immoral Expressions',³ or 'the great Loss sustained by the Hinderance this Play-house occasions to the Business of the labouring People, which is a real and certain Damage to the Nation'.⁴

III

The Puritan pamphleteers had no doubt of the origin and damnable nature of the folk ceremonies, or that they were most widespread 'insomuch that in some places, they shame not in the time of divine service, to come and daunce about the Church, and without to have men naked dauncing in nettes, which is most filthie'.⁵ We, however, remain in some doubt as to the feelings of those who took part in the ceremonies, and precise knowledge of this aspect of the Elizabethan view of life is probably not to be obtained.

It is not too difficult, in any study of the Elizabethan mental scene, to ascertain such conscious philosophical, religious, or social ideas as were argued in the Universities or the Church, or written of in books. But we cannot be so certain of the less precisely formulated beliefs, or of those unformulated assumptions as to the inevitable way of regarding daily life, which were not the subject of recorded discussion or exposition. Whatever feelings the participants had for these ceremonies must clearly have been of this nature. Those taking most part in, and most likely to be under the spell of, old customs were no doubt very often the least likely to think about their feelings or to leave any record of them if they did.

¹ *Mr. Collier's Dissuasive from the Play House; in a Letter to a Person of Quality, occasion'd by the late Calamity of the Tempest* (London, 1703).

² *Some Considerations about the Danger of going to Plays*. Anon. (London, 1704).

³ *A Representation of the Impiety and Immorality of the English Stage, with Reason for putting a Stop thereto*. Anon. (London, 1704).

⁴ *A Letter to the Right Honourable Sir Richard Brocas, Lord Mayor of London. By a Citizen* (London, 1730).

⁵ From a sermon of John Stockwood at Paul's Cross, 24 Aug. 1578. Quoted in Edward Arber's introduction to his edition of Stephen Gosson's *Schoole of Abuse* (English Reprints, London, 1868).

It is unlikely that the villager or the Londoner who went for his May-games to the Paris Garden was aware in detail of the origin and meaning of his dancing or of the fight of St. George with the Turkish Knight or Bold Slasher. No doubt he enjoyed these largely as an occasion for merrymaking. But the Englishman of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries lived by an agricultural calendar; the succession of the seasons, the driving out of Summer by Winter, and Winter by Spring, the planting and reaping of crops, celebrated as these were by festivals of immemorial antiquity, must have had a much stronger influence on his thoughts and feelings than can easily be imagined. He did not need the anthropologist's detailed knowledge of their meaning to find them both important and necessary, to feel that, in watching or taking part in the death and resurrection of the hero of the Mummers' Play and the 'driving out of Death', he was not merely amusing and entertaining himself, but taking part in a ceremony.

The thesis has been advanced by Dr. Murray that in another way, too, the themes of the yearly fertility rites were recognized by many people throughout the Middle Ages and as late as the seventeenth century. She has adduced considerable evidence to show that witchcraft was a fairly coherent survival of the old pagan religion and not merely an obscene and nauseating form of blasphemy.¹ If her theory is correct, a ritual similar in all essential points to that of Adonis and Dionysos was practised, with conscious knowledge of its meaning, by numbers of people throughout Europe as late as the time of Shakespeare.

IV

We may distinguish two ways in which the spectators' response to the stage drama may have been modified by their response to the ceremonies. The first is due to the introduction—with or without conscious intention by the dramatist—of specific themes or characters from them. The second way, less obvious but potentially more far-reaching, concerns the Elizabethan attitude towards the tragic hero. This was clearly determined by many religious, philosophical, and social factors now no longer operative, of which the presence of the ceremonies was one.

A. Themes and Characters

The theme most obviously found in both the ceremonies and the stage plays is that of Robin Hood. Sir E. K. Chambers² discusses the origin of this figure and how he found his way into the folk-plays—if he was not there from the beginning—and suggests that the linking of Robin Hood and his followers with the characters of the Mummers' Play is 'certainly . . .

¹ Margaret Murray, *The Witch Cult in Western Europe* (Oxford, 1921) and *The God of the Witches* (London, 1933).

² E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, i, ch. 8.

in part literary'.¹ But whatever the origin of the legend and its early history, it was certainly accepted as an integral part of the May-games and was represented in Spring throughout England. In L. Ramsey's *Practice of the Divell*, for example, we find:

And how it was merry when Robin Hoods plays
Was in every town, the morrice and the fool,
The maypole and the drum, to bring the calf from school,
With Midge, Madge and Marion, about the pole to dance. . . .

It seems clear that the central figure of the folk ceremonies—the man-god with whom is bound up the fertility of the land—sometimes appeared under the name of Robin Hood, just as he is usually found in the Mummers' Plays as St. George.² Joseph Ritson³ quotes the accounts of the churchwardens of the parish of Kingston-upon-Thames, where the following entry appears early in the sixteenth century:

23 Hen. 7. To the menstorell upon May-day	o o 4
For paynting of the mores garments and for sarten	
gret leveres	o 2 4
For paynting of a bannar for Robin Hode	o o 3

The most cursory examination of such a collection of ballads and fragments as that of Ritson (who accepted Robin Hood as an historical personage) demonstrates their similarity to other forms of the fertility ritual. Most striking, perhaps, is the legend of his death, which is brought about by a kinswoman who bleeds him and continues to let his blood flow out until his veins are empty, where the parallel with the fertilization of the land by the blood of the slain god is clear.

When we turn to the stage plays about Robin Hood by Munday and Chettle we find the same element of ritual. In *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon. Otherwise called Robin Hood of merrie Sherwodde* (1601), the Earl is poisoned at the instigation of King John and becomes unconscious.⁴ At the words, spoken by all the other personages on the stage:

Amen! Amen! accursed may he be
For murdering Robin, flower of courtesy

he sits up, speaks, and then commands:

Bring forth a bier, and cover it with green;
That on my deathbed I may here sit down.

¹ E. K. Chambers, *The English Folk Play*, p. 152.

² Dr. Murray also finds a link between the fertility ceremonies of witchcraft and the legend of Robin Hood, who, it seems, may perhaps have some connexion with the mysterious figure of Herne the Hunter.

³ Joseph Ritson, *Robin Hood. A Collection of all the Ancient Poems, Songs, and Ballads now extant relative to that Outlaw* (London, 1795; revised edition, 1832).

⁴ i. iii.

Later he says:

For holy dirges sing me woodmen's songs,
As ye to Wakefield walk with voices shrill—

and the song which follows is:

Weep, weep, ye woodmen wail,
Your hands with sorrow wring;
Your master Robin Hood lies dead,
Therefore sigh as you sing.

When Robin's bier is to be decked not only with a cross and holy beads but also with flowers and a bow and arrows, and the dirge continues with 'Now cast on flowers fresh and green', we may appropriately remember Prynn's denunciation of this use of 'green' as a relic of paganism.

Munday and Chettle clearly exploit the audience's responses to the folk-plays and songs of Robin Hood to achieve an effect of particular solemnity and to elevate Robert, Earl of Huntingdon, more easily to the position of a hero of tragic dignity, and almost of presiding genius of a play in whose first act he dies.

A far less serious use of the themes of the folk ceremonies is made in Thomas Nash's curious *Summer's Last Will and Testament* (printed 1600, probably written in the autumn of 1592). The play is a loosely organized affair of clown's fooling, in the mouth of Will Somers, the fool of Henry VIII, classical pastoral convention, and folk-ceremonies. Back-winter, the faithful son of Winter, threatens to kill Summer, asserting: 'I will peep forth, thy kingdom to supplant', and Bacchus and his followers jostle, cheek by jowl, with Harvest and his reapers, who sing:

Hooky, hooky, we have shorn,
And we have bound,
And we have brought Harvest
Home to town.

These are elementary examples, but a consideration of *King Lear* may serve to show a more significant presence of the ritual themes.

Miss Welsford says of *King Lear*: 'It is no mere accident that the plot of the most universal and human of tragedies should emerge from a mist of folk-tale, mythology, and primitive superstition.'¹ The story is, indeed, a common one. It is found as a folk-tale in many parts of the British Isles, most strikingly, perhaps, in the story of 'Cap of Rushes', which combines the Cinderella theme of the two older and wicked sisters who oppress the youngest one but are finally defeated with the theme of their driving out of their father and his salvation by his youngest daughter. Over fifty

¹ Welsford, op. cit., pp. 269-70.

literary versions of the story before Shakespeare's treatment of it are extant.¹

A comparison between Shakespeare's *King Lear* and *The Chronicle History of King Leir* (first performed 1594, probably published 1605)² is worth making. In the chronicle play, which in the main follows the earlier versions of the story, the intrigues of the wicked sisters before the division of the kingdom are of great importance, the play is more than half over before Leir and his faithful companion Perillus flee from a hired murderer into the country, there is no extended purgatory on the heath, Leir finally triumphs, he is never in the least insane, and there is no Fool. The most moving elements in Shakespeare's play are, in fact, not there.

Shakespeare changes the whole emphasis of the story. The conflict between Cordelia and the wicked sisters is thrust into the background. The opponents of Cordelia and Lear are defeated, yet by the end their defeat has become a side-issue. The prolonged suffering of Lear, not any conflict between good and evil characters, is the essence of the play. This suffering is aggravated by that most enigmatic of personages—the faithful but mocking Fool.

The elements introduced and stressed by Shakespeare link the play very closely with one of the annual folk-ceremonies, from one form of which it seems most probably to have been taken, either by Geoffrey of Monmouth (whose account of Lear in his Latin chronicles is the first known to us) or by an unknown writer from whom he had the story.

This ceremony, performed in most English villages at the time of Shakespeare, was the driving out of the forces of sterility, evil, and death, in the person of a scapegoat, often representing the old year, who was treated at first with regal honours, then mocked and derided, and finally expelled from the village. In origin the ritual is connected with the slaying of the divine victim, for whom was substituted at a later date a man chosen by lot, a criminal, or very often a real or pretended madman or fool.³

The original audience of *King Lear*, who saw the king banished from

¹ There is a full account of the history of the story by Dr. Wilfred Perrett: 'The Story of King Lear from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Shakespeare', *Palaestra*, xxxv (Berlin, 1904).

² This has been edited with a lengthy introduction by Sir Sidney Lee (London, 1909).

³ The temporary reign of a fool was a common idea throughout the Middle Ages and up to the time of Elizabeth, in the form of the Feast of Fools, the choosing of the King of the Bean, and the Saturnalia-like 'sotties'. We find it in the drama in, for example, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, where the king is impersonated by the fool, who is treated for some time with royal honours. Miss Welsford, in her book *The Fool*, has followed this line of thought and has drawn attention to the reiteration by Lear's Fool of the possibility of their changing places.

An identification between the scapegoat and the divine victim is, though seemingly strange, clearly found in many religious cults. Many examples of this, and of the other aspects of the annual rituals mentioned here, are to be found in Sir James Frazer's *Golden Bough*.

warmth and comfort to the misery of the heath, mocked by the Fool and driven to distraction, can hardly have failed to be sensible of a parallel with the ceremony. How consciously they were aware of it, and how conscious Shakespeare was of it himself, is of comparatively little importance.

But how did this affect their reaction to the play? In what ways would their responses differ from ours?

To suggest that, because they took part each year in the driving out of some kind of scapegoat, they would approve of Lear's expulsion is patently ridiculous. But it is reasonable to deduce that they transferred from the ceremony to the play a feeling of the inevitability of the old king's expulsion, so that a greater tension would be set up in their minds between the inevitable action and the revolt of human feelings against it. Further, if the driving out of Lear was felt to be pre-ordained there was less likelihood of their trying to explain it in terms of 'punishment', and the 'tragic flaw' was less likely to have been invoked as a moral explanation of the catastrophe.

In all probability, the audience's response to the play was more generally modified by their feeling of the parallel between the tragedy and the ceremonies, which made them less likely to fall into the error of thinking of the play in too narrowly conceived terms of naturalistic 'character study'. The personal qualities of the participants in a ritual, the peculiar virtues or vices of a scapegoat, for instance, are not of importance. The sin which the scapegoat carries is not his own, but that of the whole community; it is the ritual—in dramatic terms, the pattern or the plot—to which the spectators respond. We may expect that the audience carried something of the same attitude over to *King Lear*.

One result of paying less attention to the 'personalities' of the play is that such outbursts of Lear as:

Is man no more than this? Consider him well. Thou owest the worm no silk,
the beast no hide, the sheep no wool, the cat no perfume. Ha! here's three on's
are sophisticated; thou art the thing itself; unaccommodated man is no more but
such a poor, bare, forked animal as thou art,

or:

Plate sin with gold,
And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks;
Arm it in rags, a pigmy's straw doth pierce it,

such a realization of the contrast between man's pretensions and his impotence as:

When the rain came to wet me once and the wind to make me chatter, when
the thunder would not peace at my bidding, there I found 'em, there I smelt 'em

out. Go to, they are not men o' their words: they told me I was every thing; 'tis a lie, I am not ague proof,

cannot be so easily discounted by the uncomfortable spectator as the ravings of a madman, who, beginning as an intolerant and short-sighted tyrant, is disappointed, brought to see his limitations and finally redeemed, though in disaster, by Cordelia's love. They acquire a more objective validity. They are human society seen by the man who has been expelled from it, a view from outside, and they can be less easily dismissed. The conflict becomes far more a conflict of values, and Cordelia's love comes not to redeem Lear only, but the whole state of the world.

B. *The Tragic Hero*

One belief underlying the folk-ceremonies was that one man could suffer for another and that the welfare of many could be bound up in the fate of one person. The evil and sterility which had to be removed from the village was borne away by one man, and the resurrection of the hero of the Mummings' Play was important, not merely for himself, but for the whole community. Here there is clearly a parallel with many of the consciously held beliefs of the Elizabethans, with that interest in microcosm and macrocosm, in the correspondence between different planes of existence, in the very strong feeling that 'degree' broken in one sphere leads to disaster everywhere. Dr. Tillyard¹ has drawn attention to the strength of these conceptions, and both he and Mr. Spencer² have referred to John Case's *De Sphaera Civitatis* (Oxford, 1588), which is prefaced by a diagram depicting Queen Elizabeth as the *primum mobile*, where, behind the elaborate compliment, we may see vestiges of the belief in divine kingship. Mr. Empson says of Pandarus in *Troilus and Cressida*: 'such an identification of one person with the whole moral, social, and at last physical order, was the standing device of the metaphysicals',³ and the ease with which Donne can represent 'the frailty and decay of this whole world' 'by occasion of the untimely death of Mistris Elizabeth Drury', or say, in *A Feaver*:

O wrangling schooles, that search what fire
Shall burne this world, had none the wit
Unto this knowledge to aspire,
That this her feaver might be it

points to the prevalence of such habits of thought.

The vicarious suffering of the scapegoat or the hero of the Mummings'

¹ E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (London, 1943).

² Theodore Spencer, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man* (Cambridge, 1943).

³ William Empson, *Some Versions of Pastoral* (London, 1935), 'Double Plots', pp. 42-3.

Plays was paralleled most forcibly by the teaching of the Church on the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. Mr. Empson even goes so far as to suggest that a parallel may have been felt between the tragic hero and Christ, and certainly Prynne's *Histrionastix* complains that 'The Popishe Masse is now no other but a Tragicke Play'.

Though the audience might not consciously equate the tragic hero and the god or king who suffers and dies for his people, the prevalence of the beliefs and habits of thought described must have served to increase the hero's dignity and to have gathered around him many associations of mystery and awe. The feeling that we are all involved in one another has been invoked very often in religion: it is also one of the prerequisites for tragedy. The audience needs to be able to feel, as Shakespeare makes Octavius Caesar say, that:

The death of Antony
Is not a single doom; in the name lay
A moiety of the world.

The feeling of the supreme importance of the tragic hero was not, of course, derived from the relics of pagan folk-lore alone. It was natural to a fundamentally agrarian, feudal, and Christian people, and with the break-up of such a society it inevitably weakened or died. But undoubtedly the effect of *Hamlet* or *King Lear* or *Macbeth* on the audience of Shakespeare's day came partly from an appeal to themes and feelings instilled into the audience, not by education, but by traditional and folk-beliefs, which were the property of the peasant or the London workman perhaps even more than of the educated courtier or scholar.

v

Where the Puritans succeeded in suppressing May-games and other ceremonies, any possibility of such an appeal must have disappeared. But we should not blame the Puritans too much for their general disappearance. Such ceremonies, and the beliefs and attitudes that accompany them, are at home in a feudal and agricultural community. They may for a very short time survive that society; but not for long. They were too much out of keeping with the lives and conscious beliefs of the rising merchants of London, whose importance and influence increased as that of the old feudal families decreased, and whose town houses rose as the palaces of the old aristocratic families disappeared so rapidly from the Strand. Many of the entertainments described by Robert Laneham in 1575¹ as being

¹ Robert Laneham, 'A Letter wherein, part of the entertainment untoo the Queenz Maiesty, at Killingworth Castl, in Warwik Sheer in the Soomerz Progress 1575, iz signified: from a freend officer attendant in the Coourt, unto hiz freend a Citizen, and Merchaunt of London.' Ed. F. J. Furnivall, *Robert Laneham's Letter* (London, 1890).

presented to Queen Elizabeth on her celebrated visit to Kenilworth Castle were those which everywhere delighted rustic audiences. It is impossible to imagine such a link between the peasant and the courtier a hundred years later, and, as we have seen, later writers against the stage make little or no reference to the ceremonies in their attacks.

It would doubtless be misleading, when we consider the decay of the Jacobean drama after Shakespeare, to emphasize too strongly the inability of later writers to make any such appeals to half-realized myths. But the feeling persists, as one contrasts Shakespeare with later dramatists, that he wrote at the last moment when this background of vague and misunderstood myth could combine with other beliefs and attitudes to produce the sense of inevitability and of the solidarity of the protagonists with their people which the finest tragedy demands. In the tragedies of such a writer as Ibsen the characters seem too often not to be big enough; they speak only for themselves and their agony is separate. Lear, however feeble and insane, is a king, and round the king's person, outcast, mocked, and demented, are clustered all the associations of divinity. Ibsen cannot draw on any such fund of power, for the 'greatness' of Lear does not depend on qualities of heart and mind alone, but on non-personal qualities in which Ibsen's age seemed unable to believe.

VI

How much of the effect of Shakespearian drama is lost now because of changes in attitudes and beliefs such as we have considered, and how much will be lost in the future? A people which is urban, rationalist, and materialist—and the political colour of the materialism is irrelevant—must surely miss a great deal of their force. At the moment, the central belief of the Christian faith keeps alive in Europe, even amongst those who explicitly deny it, the concept of the God-man who is supremely important, in whom the welfare of the world is involved, and who dies that his people may have life. If this belief disappears, too, or ceases to have any effect save on a small body of believers, how will it affect (in addition to far more important things) the response of audiences to the drama of an age in which it was the central assumption?

What would an age of pure rationalism, a material and urban culture, make of Octavius's

The breaking of so great a thing should make
A greater crack; the round world
Should have shook lions into civil streets,
And citizens to their dens. The death of Antony
Is not a single doom; in the name lay
A moiety of the world.

A belief in some necessity beyond that of human and physical compulsion, in the importance of certain people which is not derived from their personality or their deeds, and in a solidarity between the hero who suffers and the rest of humanity is necessary for the writing and the full appreciation of tragedy. When they are lost tragedy can only be seen as a disastrous or pathetic story, and, as such, half its power is gone.

IZAAK WALTON AS AUTHOR OF LOVE AND TRUTH AND THEALMA AND CLEARCHUS

By H. J. OLIVER

THE attribution to Izaak Walton of the tract *Love and Truth* and the narrative poem *Thealma and Clearchus* has been common enough in the history of Walton scholarship; the weight of authority is, if anything, for his authorship of the former, against his authorship of the latter. But there is nothing like general agreement on any of the questions involved, and it would seem to be time to assemble the known evidence and add whatever one can that is new.

In doing this it is important, I believe, to put resolutely on one side any *presumption* against Walton's authorship of any work not published over his name. Too often *Love and Truth* and *Thealma and Clearchus* have been discussed in terms such as those of Nicolas, speaking of *Love and Truth*:

There is a fictitious plan in the publication which is inconsistent with Walton's scrupulous regard for veracity, and straightforward adherence to fact . . . even the most trifling artifice or simulation was repugnant to Walton's disposition¹—
or those of Saintsbury, speaking of *Thealma and Clearchus*:

Nor, though the limits of literary make-believe need not be drawn with any too Puritanical strictness, is Walton at all the man whom, without any evidence, we should suspect of a deliberate and volunteered lie.²

It may be sufficient to remark that those who have studied Walton's use of his material in the *Lives* and *The Compleat Angler* know just how fond he was of artifice and simulation, both trifling and otherwise; that if it could be shown that he wrote either *Love and Truth* or *Thealma and Clearchus*, then of course the presumption against his authorship of the other would be reversed; and that whether he wrote *Thealma and Clearchus* or not, he was certainly telling a 'lie' of some kind in his preface to the poem. Indeed, the very use of the word 'lie' seems to indicate quite the wrong frame of mind in which to approach the question.

I. *Love and Truth*

In 1680 was published 'Love and Truth: In Two modest and peaceable Letters. concerning The Distempers of the present Times. Written From a quiet and Conformable *Citizen* of London, to two busie and Factious *Shop-keepers* in Coventry', with the motto I Pet. iv. 15 'But let none of you

¹ *The Complete Angler* (London, 1836), i. c, cii.

² *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period* (Oxford, 1906), ii. 369.

suffer as a busie-body in other mens matters'. The first of the two letters is addressed to 'Good Cousin' and is signed 'Your Affectionate Friend, and Cosin, R.W.' The date is 'February the 18. 1667'. The second letter, addressed 'Dear Cousin', is signed 'Your Affectionate Kinsman, R.W.' and is dated 'September 12, 1679'. These two letters are introduced by a third, equally mysterious, 'To Mr. Henry Brome in St. Paul's Churchyard, London'. It is:

Sir,

I Here send you two Letters, (the first writ in the year 1667.) both writ by a prudent and Conformable quiet Citizen of London, to two Brothers, that now are, or were zealous, and busie Shop-keepers in Coventry; to which place I came lately; and by accident met with a grave Divine, who commended them to my reading: And having done what he desired; I thought them to speak so much real truth, and clear reason, and both so lovingly and so plainly, that I thought them worth my transcribing; and now, upon second thoughts, think them worth Printing, in order to the unbeguiling many men that mean well, and yet have been too busie in meddling, and decrying things they understand not. Pray, get them to be read by some person of honesty and judgment: And if he shall think as I do, then let them be Printed; for I hope they may turn somewhat to your own profit, but much more to the benefit of any Reader that has been mistaken, and is willing to be unbeguiled.

God keep you Sir,

Your Friend,

N.N.

May 29.

1680.

The external evidence for attributing the work to Walton is afforded by the copy in the library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.¹ It was once the property of Archbishop Sancroft (1617-93); and in a list of the tracts bound up in the volume (not merely, as some have implied, in a marginal note) he has written 'Love and Truth. Is. Walton's 2 Letters conc. y^e Distempers of y^e Times. 1680.' Moreover, in this copy, which in all other respects except the omission of the signature N.N. from the introductory letter corresponds with the one in the British Museum,² that introductory letter is headed not 'To Mr. Henry Brome in St. Paul's Churchyard, London' but 'The Author to the Stationer'; and 'Author' has been crossed out and 'Publisher' written over it in a handwriting which is very like Walton's indeed. This identification of the hand as Walton's, which seems to have been taken over by one writer from another without examination, can now be confirmed on strictly palaeographical grounds.³

¹ I am indebted to the Librarian, Mr. H. S. Bennett, for making the volume available to me at very short notice when I was preparing this article.

² Even to the wrong pagination (1-8, 17-40). (Shepherd's description in his *Waltoniana* is wrong.)

³ Professor C. J. Sisson's independent comparison of the writing in the Emmanuel copy with that of Walton's notes in his copy of the Book of Common Prayer, now in the British

The interpretation of this correction may well be considered doubtful. Pickering (in a manuscript note in the B.M. copy, C 40, c. 16) suggested that Walton wrote the introductory note only, and saw the whole work through the press. My own view would be rather that he thought better of 'The Author to the Stationer' as likely to give him away, and therefore both made the alteration in the copy he gave to Archbishop Sancroft and had this heading for the letter cancelled, substituting the form now found in the B.M. copy. But we need not insist on this. More important is Sancroft's note, on which Mr. Keynes rightly comments that 'It is unlikely that Archbishop Sancroft would be in error in his ascription, which he cannot have written long after the publication of the tract, as he died in 1693'.¹ The alternative would be to argue that Sancroft himself was misled by somebody else's superb imitation of Walton's style—and why anybody should have wanted to imitate it I cannot imagine.

There were no doubt good reasons for concealing one's authorship of such a work. Although, for example, in 1680 references to '*Oliver the Tyrant*' and '*Cromwue* the Tyrant' would have caused no trouble, one might hesitate to own to the passage about the Duke of York, 'the powerful man, that is now become of the Romish Church'.² Moreover, anonymity was usual in these pamphlet wars; and it is noticeable that the authors of the other replies to *The Naked Truth* also conceal their identities (Burnet probably among them).³

The Naked Truth. Or, The True State of the Primitive Church. By An Humble Moderator (1675, attributed to Herbert Croft) was a plea for the admission of Nonconformists into the Established Church. It apparently caused quite a sensation: the author of one of the replies to it says that 'Of all the Rarities which of late have been the discourse of the Town . . . nothing has been more talkt of, than a certain Pamphlet call'd *THE NAKED TRUTH*'.⁴ *Love and Truth* would seem to have been among the last of the answers to it; and for some reason the author of *Love and Truth* was anxious to conceal even that fact, for the first of his two letters is deceptively dated 1667. Perhaps he was adapting to the purpose of the moment some-

Museum, confirms my impression. Interesting features are the very characteristic 'p', the unusual 'r' and, particularly, the habit of breaking a word up into very short components (not syllables); this is seen again in Walton's signature as witness to a 1677 indenture (B.M. MS. Add. Ch. 66605) and in the letter to Marriot and notes for Fulman concerning the life of John Hales (Bod. MS. C.C.C. E306, ff. 78, 79, 80).

¹ *The Compleat Walton* (London, 1929), p. 625.

² *Love and Truth*, pp. 4, 34, 22.

³ The main documents are: *Lex Talionis: Or, The Author of Naked Truth Stript Naked* (1676, attributed to Philip Fell); *A Modest Survey Of the most considerable things In A Discourse Lately Published, Entitled Naked Truth. Written in a Letter to a Friend* (1676, attributed to Gilbert Burnet); and *Animadversions Upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled The Naked Truth* (1676, attributed to Francis Turner).

⁴ *Animadversions* (&c.), sig. [A3].

thing he had drafted years before the appearance of *The Naked Truth*; more probably, I think, this is yet another example of artifice for artifice's sake.

Zouch was the first to point out the convincing verbal parallels between *Love and Truth* and Walton's acknowledged work.¹ For example, with the phrase in the introductory letter 'think them worth Printing, in order to the unbeguiling many men that mean well', he compared 'that he might unbeguile and win them' from the *Life of Mr. Richard Hooker* (p. 208);² with the objection to such follies of clergymen's wives as 'their striving for precedency' (p. 19), he compared Herbert's warning to his wife 'not to claim a precedence' of any of his parishioners (pp. 295-6); he noted the similarity of the wishes in *Love and Truth* and the *Life of Herbert* that the clergy would keep the Ember Weeks strictly; and set against the remembrance of misspent hours, 'like gravel in his teeth' (*Love and Truth*, p. 21), Sanderson's prediction to a landlord that 'riches . . . would, as *Job* says, prove like gravel in his teeth' (p. 14).

Elsewhere the same quotations are used in the two works; for example, in the *Lives* Walton tells of Wotton's warning against thinking '*The farther you go from the Church of Rome, the nearer you are to God*' (p. 129), and in *Love and Truth* it is stated that those who reformed the church 'did not (as Sir Henry Wotton said wisely) think the farther they went from the Church of Rome, the nearer they got to heaven, (for they might go too far)' (p. 21).

More important, there is, in the *Life of Hooker*, the story of the Italian visitor to England who told one of his countrymen:

That the Common people of *England* were wiser than the wisest of his Nation; for, here the very *Women* and *Shop-keepers*, were able to judge of Predestination, and to determine what laws were fit to be made concerning Church-government; and then, what were fit to be obeyed or abolisht: That they were more able (or at least thought so) to raise and determine perplex Cases of Conscience, than the wisest of the most learned Colledges in *Italy*; That, men of the slightest Learning, and the most ignorant of the Common people, were mad for a new, or, *Super*, or *Re-formation* of Religion (p. 185).

In *Love and Truth* is the prophecy that disaster will overtake the nation as before:

if God be not so good to this sinful Nation, as to make the Women, the Shop-keepers, and the middle-witted People of it, less busie, and more humble and

¹ *Love and Truth* . . . A New Edition, with Notes and a Preface, by Thomas Zouch (York, 1795).

² Quotations and page references, unless otherwise stated, are from the 1675 edition of *The Lives of Dr. John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert* and the 1681 edition of *The Life of Dr. Sanderson, Late Lord Bishop of Lincoln* (printed with Sanderson's XXXV Sermons). I everywhere preserve Walton's italics.

lowly in their own eyes, and to think that they are neither called, nor are fit to meddle with, and judge of the most hidden and mysterious points in *Divinity*, and Government of the *Church and State*: And instead of being *Busie bodies*, (which St. *Peter* accounts to be a sin, 1 Pet. 4. 15.) to follow that counsel which St. *Paul* gives to his *Thessalonians*, *To study to be quiet, and to do their own business*, 2 Thes. 4. 11. (p. 23.)

Quite apart from the echoes of phrases which Walton has used previously when thinking of the same subject, and the use of his favourite biblical quotation (it comes into *Love and Truth* several times), these sentiments are obviously identical.

Zouch could have gone farther and have clinched his point. There are other expressions of Walton's belief that the common people should mind their own business, particularly in questions of religion, both in *Love and Truth* and the *Lives*. In the *Lives* there are at least two comments: '*Laws are not made for private men to dispute, but to Obey*' (p. 207) and 'the common people, who in this Nation think they are not wise, unless they be busie about what they understand not' (p. 48); and in *Love and Truth* the further passages:

Can you, that are a Shop-keeper, or private man, think that you are fit to *teach and judge the Church*, or the Church fit to teach and judge you? Or can you think the safety or peace of the State or Church in which you live should depend upon the scruples and mistakes of a party of the Common People, whose indiscreet and active zeal makes them like the restless *Scribes and Pharisees*? (p. 28.)

Remember you and I are but Citizens, and must take much that concerns our Religion and Salvation upon trust. (p. 38.)

And doubtless this is the Ambition of many Women, Shop-keepers and other of the Common People of very mean parts; who would not be admired or noted if they did not trouble themselves and others, by holding some odd, impertinent, singular opinions. (p. 29.)

Passages dealing with Laud, Charles I, and the Puritans can be placed alongside each other with the same effect. In *Love and Truth* the two of particular interest are:

There is a great stock of *innocent blood* to be answered for; not only the blood of our late *Vertuous King* and the blood of the *Archbishop of Canterbury*, and the Lord *Strafford*, whose deaths were occasioned by the indiscreet zeal and restless fury and clamours of the Non-conformists: And not only the blood of these, but the ruine of many good and innocent Families, that now eat the bread of sorrow, by being impoverished and undone by these troublesom Pretenders to Conscience; and which is worse, there is a corruption of the innocence and manners of the greatest part of the Nation to be answered for; and all this occasioned by our late Civil War; and that War, occasioned by the fury and zeal of the discontented restless Non-conformists; and them only (p. 5);

and:

... that Parliament, 1640. that murdered Dr. *Laud*, the late religious *Bishop of Canterbury*, the late good and pious King *Charles*, and were the cause of spilling so much innocent blood, and ruine of so many harmless Families. (p. 30.)

These compare closely with the well-known passage in the *Life* of Sander-son in which Walton speaks of the 'discontented party of the Scots Church' who were 'zealously restless for another Reformation of their Kirk Govern-ment', refers to the Parliamentary allies of 'these very zealous, and as factious Reformers' who misled 'the very common people of this Nation', and adds:

But when I look back upon the ruine of Families, the bloodshed, the decay of common honesty, and how the former piety and plain-dealing of this now sinful Nation is turn'd into cruelty and cunning, when I consider this, I praise God that he prevented me from being of that Party which help'd to bring in this Covenant, and those sad Confusions that have follow'd it. (pp. 16-17.)

There are also similar references to 'the learned and good Archbishop *Laud*' and 'the knowing and conscientious King *Charles the I*'; and other complaints about the degeneracy of 'this age' which are parallel to the description of it in *Love and Truth* as 'an Age, in which Contention increases, and Charity decays' (p. 39).

The resemblances on smaller matters of opinion and expression are equally striking. For example, Walton shared Fuller's dislike of the term 'Puritan' and studiously avoids it in the *Lives*; in *Love and Truth* it is used only in parenthesis: 'The Nonconformists (which are in that Report called by the name of *Puritans*)' (p. 3). In the Epistle to the Reader of the *Lives* he refers to 'them, that then call'd themselves the Godly Party'; in *Love and Truth* the references are indirect and even sarcastic in the same way: 'those *Tryers*, and their Brethren of the several Committees, who came by degrees to distinguish themselves from others, by calling themselves, *The Godly Party*' (p. 25) and 'those that were so shameless as to call themselves the *godly party*' (p. 34).

Walton has, too, a fondness for certain phrases, particularly biblical phrases, which he introduces more or less indiscriminately into his own narration and the reported speeches of his subjects. For example, his wife is described, in the Epitaph he drafted, as a woman 'of the primitive Piety'; Whitgift, according to Wotton, was a man 'of the primitive temper' (p. 187); Hooker trod 'the footsteps of primitive piety' (p. 222); and Herbert's life is an example 'of primitive piety' (p. 293). And so in *Love and Truth* Father Fulgentio is made to speak of the Roman Church as one which has departed 'from the Primitive purity' (p. 27).¹

¹ 'The primitive Church', 'primitive Christians', and 'primitive Times' are common

Yet another mannerism is that of bringing what might be a long digression to a close with the words 'But I forbear'. So in the *Life* of Donne he writes: 'More observations of this nature, and inferences from them, might be made to gain the relation a firmer belief: but I forbear' and 'More of this, and more witnesses might be brought, but I forbear and return' (pp. 32, 41). A typical example in *Love and Truth* is: 'Much more might be said for bowing at the *Altar*, and bowing toward the *East*: But I forbear' (p. 30).

It would seem certain that we here have Walton making the most of all his favourite ideas and phrases. That it was his custom to make the most of them, even at the risk of wearing them threadbare, a study of *The Compleat Angler* proves beyond doubt.

The author of *Love and Truth* even has Walton's fondness for discussing the Church service; into both letters are inserted explanations of the meaning and purpose of the service, exactly parallel to the digression in the *Life* of Herbert. *Love and Truth* has, too, the same knowledge of church history—and the same faults of style, the sentences having here, as in Walton's acknowledged work, much of the formlessness of speech.

It even contains a reference to 'the holy life and happy death of Mr. George Herbert, as it is plainly and I hope truly writ by Mr. Isaac Walton'. 'Plainly and I hope truly'? It is difficult to believe that anybody could ever seriously have questioned the authorship of that.

II. *Thealma and Clearchus*

Thealma and Clearchus. A Pastoral History, in smooth and easie Verse. Written long since, by John Chalkhill, Esq; An Acquaintant and Friend of Edmund Spencer was published in 1683, the year of Walton's death. The preface is signed 'J.W.' and J.W. is certainly Walton because with the poem were printed Flatman's lines 'To my worthy Friend Mr Isaac Walton; On the Publication of this Poem'.

The preface is:

The Reader will find in this Book, what the Title declares, *A Pastoral History, in smooth and easie Verse*; and will in it find many *Hopes* and *Fears* finely painted, and feelingly express'd. And he will find the first so often disappointed, when fullest of desire and expectation; and the later, so often, so strangely, and so unexpectedly reliev'd, by an unforeseen Providence, as may beget in him wonder and amazement.

And the Reader will here also meet with Passions heightened by easie and fit descriptions of *Joy* and *Sorrow*; and find also such various events and rewards of *innocent Truth* and *undissembled Honesty*, as is like to leave in him (if he be a

enough in theological pamphlets of the period, but not, I think, this preference for using 'primitive' with an abstract noun describing character.

good natur'd Reader) more sympathizing and virtuous Impressions, than ten times so much time spent in impertinent, critical, and needless Disputes about Religion: and I heartily wish it may do so.

And, I have also this truth to say of the Author, that he was in his time a man generally known, and as well belov'd; for he was humble, and obliging in his behaviour, a Gentleman, a Scholar, very innocent and prudent: and indeed his whole life was useful, quiet, and virtuous. God send the Story may meet with, or make all Readers like him.

May 7. 1678

J.W.

A case for Walton's authorship of the poem might almost be based on that preface, for the tone of it seems to be playful—just the tone that would be adopted by an old man, well over eighty, who is putting before the world the work with which he has amused himself for years and which he has never taken seriously. It reminds one immediately of the reference in *Love and Truth* to the *Life* of Herbert; it is also like the tone of the letter to Aubrey about Ben Jonson.

Lowell points out, too, that 'the gap of five years between the date of the preface and that of publication is hard to explain if we suppose him to have been merely the editor. The hesitation of an author venturing himself, even under an alias, in a new direction, seems a more natural explanation.'¹

Moreover, the poem is unfinished, although it is of 3,170 lines; and after the last words, spoken by Cleon:

kill not hope
Before its time, and let it raise your spirit
To bear your sorrows nobly: never fear it,
Thealma lives.

a note has been added: '*And here the Author dy'd, and I hope the Reader will be sorry.*' Can that be anything but Walton's joke at himself?

Ever since 1820, when Samuel Singer suggested that there was no such person as Chalkhill,² critical opinion has been divided. Sir Harris Nicolas, Saintsbury, and Andrew Lang, for example, reject Walton's authorship, Gosden and Gosse accept it, and Mr. Massingham would like to accept it.³

It may be admitted immediately that the external evidence on which Gosse based his opinion is not as clear-cut as he evidently thought. He

¹ *Latest Literary Essays and Addresses* (London, 1891), p. 86.

² *Select Early English Poets. Edited by S. W. Singer, Esq. No. VI. Containing Chalkhill's 'Thealma and Clearchus'* (London, 1820).

³ Nicolas, *The Complete Angler* (London, 1836); Saintsbury, *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period* (Oxford, 1906); Lang, *The Complete Angler* (London, 1896); Gosden, notes to Zouch, *The Life of Isaac Walton* (London, 1823); Gosse, *From Shakespeare to Pope* (Cambridge, 1885); Massingham, *A Treasury of Seventeenth Century English Verse* (London, 1919), p. 326.

commented: 'Flatman's poem has, I think, been overlooked as a contemporary testimony to Walton's authorship.'¹ It had probably been not overlooked but interpreted differently. The poem, as it appeared with *Thealma and Clearchus*, is:

Long had the bright *Thealma* lain obscure,
 Her beauteous Charms that might the world allure,
 Lay, like rough Diamonds in the Mine, unknown;
 By all the Sons of Folly trampled on,
 Till your kind hand unveil'd her lovely Face,
 And gave her vigor to exert her Rays.
 Happy Old Man, whose worth all mankind knows,
 Except himself, who charitably shows
 The ready road to Virtue, and to Praise,
 The Road to many long, and happy days;
 The noble Arts of generous Piety,
 And how to compass true felicity,
 Hence did he learn the Art of living well,
 The bright *Thealma* was his Oracle:
 Inspir'd by her, he knows no anxious cares,
 Thro near a Century of pleasant years;
 Easie he lives, and chearful shall he die,
 Well spoken of by late Posterity.
 As long as *Spencer's* noble flames shall burn,
 And deep Devotions throng about his Urn;
 As long as *Chalkhill's* venerable Name,
 With humble emulation shall inflame
 Ages to come, and swell the Rolls of Fame:
 Your memory shall ever be secure,
 And long beyond our short-liv'd Praise endure;
 As *Phidias* in *Minerva's* Shield did live,
 And shar'd that immortality he alone could give.

June 5. 1683.

Tho. Flatman

How exactly is one to interpret that? The opening lines *might* mean that Flatman believed Walton to be rescuing from obscurity a poem written by another; and the statement that Walton's fame will live as long as Chalkhill's *need* not mean that Walton is Chalkhill (any more than the statement that Walton's fame will live as long as Spenser's means that Walton is Spenser). On the other hand, the 'Happy Old Man' of l. 7, whom some think to be Chalkhill, is surely Walton, who has known no anxious cares through *near a century* of pleasant years. (He was 89.) The disconcerting change from the second to the third person and back again is the difficulty; and it is altered in a later version of the poem in the 1686 edition of Flatman's works.

¹ Op. cit., p. 209, n. 2.

Here 'thy self' is substituted for 'himself' in l. 8. Another alteration of ll. 17-18 to read:

Easie he lives, and easie shall he lie
On the soft bosom of Eternity.

was surely made because of Walton's death in 1683. This means that it is Walton who is referred to throughout, even where the third person is kept. One accepts gratefully the view of the author of the article on *Thealma and Clearchus* in the *Retrospective Review* for 1821:

If applied merely to the writer of the scanty preface . . . they (i.e. Flatman's lines) are little better than absurd; but, if written in the belief that Walton was the real, but concealed author, if not very apposite, they are, at least, intelligible.¹

It may be added that Flatman, a friend both of Walton and of Cotton, was in a position to know the facts; and that although one might say the author of *Thealma and Clearchus* was 'inspir'd' by it so that his cares disappeared, it would be difficult indeed to believe that Flatman thought any reader of the poem, even its editor, could have been inspired by it for nearly a century.

Attempts to attribute the poem to various Chalkhills can be answered easily enough. Nares, Nicolas, and Lang, for example, believe that it was written by the John Chalkhill (1599-1679) who was a fellow of Winchester College and 'a man after Walton's own heart' (as Lang puts it).² Obviously this does not fit in with the description in the Preface and on the title-page, for this Chalkhill could not possibly have been a friend of Spenser, and could not have been referred to as dead in 1678, when Walton's Preface was dated. This certainly does not acquit Walton of deception.

More common, and more important, is Saintsbury's argument,³ that *Thealma and Clearchus* was written by the John Chalkhill who was Walton's second wife's stepmother's father and may have been a coroner of Middlesex towards the end of Elizabeth's reign. (*The Dictionary of National Biography* adds the information that he sometimes signed himself 'Jon' or 'Jo'.) But if this attribution would explain how Walton came to be in possession of manuscripts unknown to anyone else, it might equally well explain how he came to chose 'Jo. Chalkhill' as a pseudonym, just as to-day many an author has chosen his mother's maiden name. Besides, this attribution does not square with the general style of the poem (and those who believe that it was originally by Chalkhill therefore generally add that Walton touched it up before publication). Lowell noted, for example, that

¹ *Retrospective Review*, iv (1821), 234. Gosden was almost certainly the author; he uses similar words in his footnotes to Zouch's *Life of Isaac Walton* (1823), pp. 57-8.

² Nares, MS. notes in B.M. copy G 11510; Nicolas, op. cit., p. xcvi; Lang, op. cit., pp. xxix-xxx.

³ Op. cit. ii. 369.

the language of *Thealma and Clearchus* is 'altogether too modern' for an Elizabethan;¹ and Saintsbury himself admitted that the 'constant' 'unbridled' use of 'the breathless, enjambed, overlapping decasyllabic couplet' is amazingly early for a non-dramatic poet if we are to attribute the poem to an Elizabethan Chalkhill and can be paralleled only by the far later work of *Marmion* and *Chamberlayne*.² This is not a question of re-touching.

It is easy enough to trace similarities between *Thealma and Clearchus* and Walton's acknowledged work. For example, Walton seems to have been in constant fear of having too many end-stopped lines, and has a characteristic way of making the sense run on, seen in the opening lines of the *Elegy on Dr. Donne*:

Our *Donne* is dead! and, we may sighing say,
We had that man where Language chose to stay
And shew her utmost power. I wou'd not praise
That, and his great Wit, which in our vain days
Make others proud; but, as these serv'd to unlock
That Cabinet his mind

or in these lines from *The Angler's Wish*:

And raise my low pitcht thoughts above
Earth, or what poor mortals love.

So it is again and again in *Thealma and Clearchus*:

if you had bid
Me do a thing (p. 7, ll. 110-11)

pardon your Handmaid,
Unworthy of the Wages your love paid
Me (p. 11, ll. 187-9)

sweet Virgin lead
Me from this Labyrinth of Doubts (p. 17, ll. 312-13)
He made enquiry what each man possesst
During *Lysander's* reign, to re-invest
Them in their honor'd places (p. 80, ll. 1,496-8)

He entertains
Them with desire (p. 114, ll. 2,155-6)—

¹ Op. cit., p. 84. There is, however, nothing in Lowell's point about the elision of the 'e' of the past participle. The 'e' is certainly not elided in lines like 'The wronged Poor necessity 'gan teach' (l. 457), 'Twice measured the Earth, when Love strook blind' (l. 515); 'Himself t'appease th'incensed Destinies' (l. 737) and 'For his supposed loss, so being found' (l. 1,556). The line numbering is Saintsbury's; but I quote always from the original edition, where the lines are not numbered. In that edition, the lines just quoted are on pp. 25, 28, 40, 83.

² Op. cit. ii. 370. I should like to record Professor G. D. Willcock's impression that the metre and style of the poem place it, in its present form, in the mid-seventeenth century.

and examples can be multiplied. Again, Lowell was undoubtedly right in saying that Walton's acknowledged verse and *Thealma and Clearchus* have similar imperfect rhymes; in *Thealma*, too, one finds Walton's habit (albeit a common one at the time) of rhyming words by throwing on to them a stress they will not easily bear.

Indeed, the false rhymes are partly in joke ('Eubolus' and 'studious?'); and I would suggest that critics have taken the poem far too seriously. It has its faults: the discursiveness that Lowell and Saintsbury discuss is no doubt there, the author has little skill in narrative, and except when he strangely gives his story away by foretelling the identity of one of his heroines:

But that he calls her *Florimel*, the force
Of his strong passions had persuaded him
It had been his *Clarinda*, (as in time
The story makes her;) (p. 64, ll. 1,197-1,200)

he merely puzzles by abrupt changes and inconclusiveness. But he knows the faults and makes fun of them:

And now it is high time my Muse to lewre
From her too tedious weary flight, and tell
What to *Anaxus* that brave Youth befel.
Let's pause awhile, she'll make the better flight,
The following lines shall feed your appetite (p. 94, ll. 1,761-5)

I'll tell you more hereafter, friendship's laws
Will not deny a friendly rest to pause (p. 135, ll. 2,357-8)

Thus for a while we leave him, till my Quill
Weary and blunted with so long a story,
Rest to be sharpen'd, and then she is for ye. (p. 129, ll. 2,432-4)

If Byron had read that and attributed it to Walton, he would surely have felt more sympathy with the 'quaint, old, cruel, coxcomb'. Nor would he have failed to appreciate the lines describing Caretta:

How soe're she goes,
Few maids have such an inside to their cloaths (p. 77, ll. 1,443-4)

not to mention:

Lysander he
Was where a Husband lately wed should be,
At home a weaning of his wives desires,
From her old Sire, to warm her at his fires (p. 29, ll. 540-3)

Kings need not to woove;
The very name will bring a nun to bed,
Ambition values not a Maiden-head (p. 28, ll. 521-3)

and

to augment their Fare,
Their second Courses, good Discourses were. (p. 21, ll. 381-2)

The tone of the repeated expressions of fatigue confirms the general impression that short sections of the poem were jotted down from time to time; and the carelessness, grammatical errors, and confusion indicate lack of revision. These points are quite consistent with the view that Walton wrote the poem over a period of years, as a spare-time occupation; they are hardly consistent with the theory of revision of another's work.

One other feature of *Thealma and Clearchus* which has escaped notice is the occasional use of obsolescent and dialectal words. Of these the author has a very poor stock; he seems to throw one in whenever he thinks of it. 'Whilom', 'ylearnt', and 'otherwhiles' appear at least once, 'hight' about four times (e.g. 'A river ran, Hight Cygnus' p. 2, ll. 23-4). He has also a peculiar liking for the word 'tole' or 'toal', meaning to entice, attract, or draw; the word is used by Milton but is mainly dialectal. Another dialectal word is 'worl', used apparently to equal 'cast' or 'hurl' (it is printed in italics on p. 84, l. 1577). I can find no close parallels to 'his eye Impt with delight upon her' (p. 124, ll. 2344-5), explained by Saintsbury, no doubt correctly, as 'an extension of the sense of *grafting*'—but hardly a natural one; and 'chud' as the past tense of 'chide' ('She could have heard her speak an age, sweet soul, / So pretty loud she chud her and condole' p. 10, ll. 173-5) is certainly open to suspicion. So are abbreviations like 'mplored' ('They 'mplored his help', p. 12, l. 215) and 'nkind', ('so 'nkind', p. 16, l. 287).¹ One would expect a more consistent use of language from a poet who was writing with no ulterior motive; but are not these devices exactly what one would anticipate from a writer half-heartedly trying to make a poem appear older than it really was—as if written by the 'Acquaintant and Friend of Edmund Spencer'?

Saintsbury says of Walton that we cannot 'readily pay him the compliment of believing that he had poetry enough for *Thealma and Clearchus*'.² He seems to me to over-rate the narrative ('it never soars: but always floats along on an easy wing'; 'hardly an English poet has given the difficult, artificial, and generally questionable "pastoral" tone better than Chalkhill'); he certainly under-rates Walton, who 'had poetry enough' for even the better parts of *Thealma*. I would instance the lines introduced in *The Compleat Angler* by the words 'I . . . made a conversion of a piece of an old Catch, and added more to it' (*Mans life is but vain . . .*). It should

¹ Professor Willcock drew my attention to Butler's 's' averse' (*Hudibras*, iii. 1375) and Crashaw's 'we'are', 'I'am', &c., where presumably either vowel could be elided in reading. The date of these parallels is significant.

² Op. cit. ii. 371.

be added that it is impossible to distinguish the merits and style of this song from the two which Walton attributes to Chalkhill ('Coridon's Song' and 'O the gallant Fishers life'). One of these Piscator claims to have patched up by help of his own invention; so that songs by Chalkhill, by Chalkhill and Walton, and by Walton and another, are indistinguishable in manner. And the name of 'Jo. Chalkhill' as the author of those two songs is first given in the *third* edition of the *Angler* (pp. 78, 210)—as an afterthought, perhaps when he had begun to play with the idea of publishing *Thealma and Clearchus* under Chalkhill's name?

If this stops short of complete proof that Walton wrote *Thealma and Clearchus*, it does at least, I suggest, make it probable that he wrote it (and so put the onus of proving their case on those who think otherwise). I could find it in my heart to hope that he wrote it; I should rather like to picture him thus, enjoying this secret vice of versifying and finally working it off on an unsuspecting public, even if, like most of his little jokes, it went unnoticed.

RHYTHMICAL FEATURES IN DR. JOHNSON'S PROSE

By CECIL S. EMDEN

IF adjustment of style to subject-matter is crucial to good writing, Dr. Johnson went a long way towards satisfying that condition in his moral essays. A constant succession of balanced phrases is an appropriate medium for the preceptor who is engaged in holding one set of moral balances after another. This strongly marked characteristic in most of the periodical essays in the *Rambler*, and in many in the *Adventurer* and the *Idler*, is the basis of his rhetorical diction. It has even been said of him that, as regards his writing in the *Rambler*, rhythm was his master rather than his servant. This must be taken as a mischievous perversion of the situation. But, as is universally agreed, his dogged individualism led him to excess. He delighted so much in his parallelisms and antitheses that his style is frequently described in the uncomplimentary epithet, sonorous. Being sonorous is not very far from being soporific; and it is true of many readers that the moral essays can only be taken in small doses if the mental faculties are to remain reasonably alert. This may, perhaps, provide the explanation for the limited investigation that has been made into the rhythmical aspects of Dr. Johnson's prose style.

It would have been difficult for writers on that debatable subject, prose rhythm, to have overlooked so salient a field for examples. Professor Saintsbury, for instance, who deals with the subject historically in his *History of English Prose Rhythm*, and Mr. N. R. Tempest, who deals with it analytically in his *Rhythm of English Prose*, both give examples from the moral essays and make comments on them. They naturally have not room for more than passing references. But persistent readers, who read with the ear as well as with the eye, will, it is suggested, be conscious not merely of a general rhythmical ability but of some determinate and recurrent metrical and rhythmical patterns which are significant in the study of Johnsonian style. The present discussion is not intended, then, to deal with rhythm at large. It is intended to bring together and to analyse evidence of some particular features, the existence of which will, it is believed, be admitted, in its classified form, even by some who are normally distrustful of conclusions about prose rhythm.

Dr. Johnson, like many other writers, took particular care about the lilt of the final phrases in his paragraphs. Indeed, we shall see that he took almost immoderate care. Often, in polished prose-writing, especially that of essayists, we may notice that paragraphs or chapters are rounded off with

a phrase that harmonizes with the mood in sound as well as in meaning. There may be, for instance, warning, expectancy, or optimism. It is natural that this kind of ending should have a metrical quality. Study of Dr. Johnson's concluding phrases, especially those winding up a subject or an argument, indicates that he contracted a habit of stereotyping certain metrical patterns, about a dozen of them. The shorter ones are such as might be used by any prose author whose type of writing is forceful; and these are by no means too manifest. But the longer ones are very markedly individual, and are, perhaps, open to the criticism of obtruding verse into prose. The exemplification of these metrical patterns, which this article provides, is inevitably rather a lengthy business. But it is hoped that the selected instances, together with comments, will be of assistance to students of Dr. Johnson's literary methods. The evidence may suggest to some that he had a higher degree of literary sensibility than they suspected, a greater capacity for displaying 'the colours of varied diction', to use his own expression (*Adv.* 115). It may also suggest to others that, in certain respects, the imputation of artificiality in his style is additionally supported.

Whether the metrical and other patterns were introduced consciously or not may be thought to be irrelevant as far as literary criticism is concerned. But the point is of concern to those who connect literary method with the author's personality. Dr. Johnson's interest in prosody and, especially, problems of accommodating sound to sense was evidently considerable. He investigated the subject in those essays in the *Rambler* which dealt with Milton's poems, and also in his essays on Pope and Cowley in the *Lives of the Poets*. In effect, he deplored the mere employment of onomatopoeic expressions in the attempted union of sound and sense, and remarked that a better way is by relating motion (by which he meant rhythm) to sense. In illustration of this he quoted a passage from a poem which included a description of the labours of Sisyphus; first, a slow, ponderous, progressive rhythm as the stone is rolled upwards, and, secondly, an abrupt, jerky rhythm as the stone bumped violently down again. The fact that he showed himself to be highly critical of poets who attempted 'representative metre', sound for sense, and even satirized foolish views on this practice (*I.* 60) provides no ground for supposing that he did not aspire to use such methods in his own prose-writing.

He was highly appreciative of the value of prose rhythm, a subject which, under the description of 'numerous prose', came up in a conversation recorded by Boswell (*Life*, ed. Hill, iii. 257). Dr. Johnson remarked: 'Sir William Temple was the first writer who gave cadence to English prose. Before his time they were careless of arrangement, and did not mind whether a sentence ended with an important word or an insignificant word, or with what part of speech it was concluded.' On another occasion he

told Boswell that he had partly formed his style upon Temple's; and he evidently found him a useful model, for the concluding words of many of the paragraphs in Temple's essays are carefully turned, with a noticeably rhythmical quality.

Some detailed evidence of Dr. Johnson's conscious employment of metrical patterns is more conveniently left until after examples of them have been quoted.

Authorities on prose rhythm have recognized the importance of the study of concluding phrases of sentences and paragraphs; and some of them, including Mr. Tempest, have provided useful analyses. Metrical patterns occurring in prose are sometimes described by the experts as 'cadences', and are treated separately from prose rhythm in general, as being distinct in certain respects, in particular owing to their being normally confined to a small number of words and to their capacity for starting in the middle of a word. Moreover, they always start on a stressed, or long, syllable. Most of Dr. Johnson's metrical patterns, at the ends of his paragraphs, are considerably more elaborate than those identified in the writings of other authors.

The simpler and shorter of the patterns are in a metre with a triple foot, anapaestic (˘ ˘ ˘) or dactylic (˘ ˘ ˘). The more elaborate ones are extensions of these, a paemonic metre with a quadruple foot (˘ ˘ ˘ ˘). The anapaestic metre is generally used in poetry for light-hearted themes, or to suggest movement and excitement. Shortly before Dr. Johnson's time, it had been experimented with by Dryden; and it had also been exploited by Prior in such lines as: 'Her will with her duty so equally stood', and 'From chiding the footmen and watching the lasses'. In Dr. Johnson's day it was used, for instance, by Goldsmith in his light satires on Burke and Garrick. But Dr. Johnson only used brief patterns of this metre in his prose, hardly long enough to gain the 'tripping' effect that results from a larger number of feet. His anapaestic endings are mostly impressive ones, occasionally with stresses suggestive of doom and destiny. The author can be easily imagined as thumping the table ominously as the discourse draws to a conclusion.

Class I. ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘.

(a) The subject of the essay is the contemplation of death, one on which Dr. Johnson felt particularly strongly. A paragraph concludes:

We may then usefully revolve the uncertainty of our own condition, and the folly of lamenting that from which, if it had stayed a little longer, we should ourselves have been taken away. (R. 17)

(b) Another paragraph in the same essay ends:

He is sure that he destroys his happiness, but is not sure that he lengthens his life. (R. 17)

(c) A third example is chosen from a narrative essay which discloses the experiences of a sceptic.

I was weary of continual irresolution, and a perpetual equipoise of the mind; and ashamed of being the favourite of those who were scorned and shunned by the rest of mankind. (R. 95)

In all these three examples the three strong stresses in the metrical pattern give a sense of forcefulness and finality.

Class 2. - - - - -

This metrical pattern, with the unstressed syllable at the end, is less apt for gloomy inferences than the preceding one, but it is used in much the same way, to drive home a conclusion. It is often found as the second of two balanced clauses; and it is in this situation that it is most effective.

(a) The dismal maxim of one Bias of Priene, that the majority of men are wicked, is being upheld.

... and may see, on every side, some entangling themselves in perplexities, and some sinking into ruin, by neglect of the maxim of Bias. (R. 175)

(b) In an essay on the uncertainty of human life, the pattern is used to enhance the surprise element in the second of two balanced clauses, which deals cynically with a precept against procrastination.

... this every moralist may venture to inculcate, because it will always be approved, and because it is always forgotten. (Adv. 108)

(c) In the second of two balanced clauses again:

... and we are happy or miserable, according as we are affected by the survey of our life, or our prospect of future existence. (R. 41)

(d) This metre can, however, be used, as it generally is in poetry, to convey a more breezy air. For instance:

... he is driven by the sternness of the *Rambler's* philosophy to more cheerful and airy companions. (R. 208)

Class 3. - - - - -

We are next concerned with examples of the extension of the anapaestic metre. Professor Saintsbury has described it as a normal one for metrical

effects in prose rhythm. It was chiefly used by versifiers in Dr. Johnson's day for light satires and impromptu skits. He himself played with it in one or two poetical trifles. Nowadays it is chiefly confined in poetry to the more jaunty verses of such poets as Kipling and Masfield, or to the humour of A. A. Milne's verses for children, with such scurrying, scampering lines as: 'They pulled him out and dried him, and they blipped him on the head.'

Class 3 is a particularly interesting one, as it may well have relations with the heroic couplet, as is suggested later. When this pattern occurs in the moral essays it often has an air of kindly sentiment or even soft emotion. It is noteworthy that it is not used as part of a scheme of balance, as in the previous class. It is frequently and effectively used as the concluding passage in an essay; and for this position the stress on the last syllable renders it particularly suitable.

(a) An essay deals with the folly of anger and the miseries of a peevish old age.

... he only adds deliberate to hasty folly, aggravates petulance by contumacy, and destroys the only plea that he can offer for the tenderness and patience of mankind. (R. 11)

(b) The subject is the desire for variety in life.

... and resolves to take hereafter his fill of diversions or display his abilities on the universal theatre, and enjoy the pleasure of distinction and applause. (R. 207)

The metre serves to improve the contrast between cold solitude and the warm colours of a life of social success.

(c) The opposite contrast is also made:

... shrinks back again to ignorance and rest. (R. 103)

(d) This pattern is well suited to the suggestion of fresh air and freedom.

... he placed me in the way that leads soonest from the prescribed walks of discipline and education, to the open fields of liberty and choice. (R. 95)

(e) This and the two following examples are of the concluding words of essays. There are several other instances of the same kind in the *Rambler* and the *Idler*. Looked at together they form a notable factor in the evidence designed to prove Dr. Johnson's well-formed practice of using metrical patterns for effective conclusions. The subject of the first of these endings is one which is germane to the present discussion, namely, Milton's accommodation of sound to sense.

... he [Milton] ... might have been accused of neglecting his cause, had he lavished much of his attention upon syllables and sounds. (R. 94)

Mere syllables and sounds were, perhaps, trivialities for Milton, with his solemn task of enforcing moral and religious truths. The triviality is impressed on the reader by the use of the tripping metre with which the essay ends.

(f) It is not possible for an author to be slapdash in his methods and to produce work unworthy of his talents

without injuring his honour and his quiet. (R. 169)

(g) After a long catalogue of the obstacles confronting an aspiring author, a subject on which Dr. Johnson could speak feelingly, the essay ends:

... and he that finds his way to reputation through all these obstructions, must acknowledge that he is indebted to other causes besides his industry, his learning, or his wit. (R. 2)

It is fairly obvious that there is a connexion between the metre of the heroic couplet and the endings of Dr. Johnson's essays in the metrical pattern of which examples have just been given. We may recall that he had a retentive memory for poetry and was fond of reciting passages from Pope and others. His literary taste made it natural that the heroic couplet should provide a refrain always easily recurrent to his mind. This famous metre, as developed by Dryden and Pope, and by Dr. Johnson himself, often included lines which would have well fitted the metrical pattern just exemplified, if the first syllable is neglected. How easy it would be for Dr. Johnson to borrow a line from, say, Dryden for this purpose can be illustrated by his actual importation of all but the first syllable of a line from Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel* into the end of a paragraph of a letter to Mrs. Thrale (*Letters*, ed. Hill, no. 553). The paragraph concludes: 'He is one of those who finds every hour *something new to wish or to enjoy*.' It is natural enough to discover, as we can, Dr. Johnson using metrical patterns for ending paragraphs in the more carefully written letters to Mrs. Thrale, especially where moral problems are involved (e.g. nos. 318, 329, 686, 724, 953).

The fashion for a pause after the fourth or fifth syllable of the line of a heroic couplet, as well as for the frequent use of balance, would help to encourage a writer familiar with that metre to be influenced by it in rounding off his prose periods. Especially would this be so when much of both the poetry and the prose was concerned with didactic themes. Balance invested the writing of the heroic couplets and also that of the moral essays with an atmosphere of brisk and trenchant finality, suitable to moral edification. It is not necessary to search diligently into Dr. Johnson's finest poem,

The Vanity of Human Wishes, to find concluding lines to sections of the poem that would be admirably adapted to the ends of paragraphs of his moral essays. For instance, 'Unlocks his gold and counts it till he dies', and, 'To point a moral, or adorn a tale'. The balanced and antithetical diction, and the grave moral eloquence of this poem, which was written about fifteen months before the *Rambler* began to appear, are comparable with similar features in the moral essays.

Class 4. — — — — —

This pattern, like those in some of the following classes, where the number of unstressed syllables increases, is freely used, as might be expected, in a vein of light satire or scornfulness. While it is also used simply as a means of matching the liveliness of the words, it sometimes succeeds in adding point to a dramatic or epigrammatic conclusion.

(a) Fantastic attempts to portray tragedy can only produce ridicule. This sentiment is developed in a supercilious remark to the effect

that the robes of royalty can give no dignity to nonsense or to folly. (*R.* 125)

(b) Virtuosos are warned in contemptuous terms not to allow their foibles to do more than

diversify the day with slight amusements. (*Adv.* 119)

(c) The proper cure for sorrow is a sharp contrast, in which activity replaces inertia. Sorrow is described as

the putrefaction of stagnant life, and remedied by exercise and motion. (*R.* 47)

(d) Other lively contrasts are similarly effected. A writer describing his travels should

enable his readers to compare their condition with that of others, to improve it whenever it is worse, and whenever it is better to enjoy it. (*I.* 97)

(e) A significant climax to an epigrammatic conclusion is emphasized by the brisk accents of the metrical pattern.

A man whose great qualities want the ornament of superficial attractions, is like a naked mountain with mines of gold, which will be frequented only till the treasure is exhausted. (*R.* 72)

(f) The pattern is sometime adapted so as to reflect a philosophic mood. Principles of truth are apt to be obliterated.

. . . they lose their strength and splendour, and fade at last in total evanescence. (*R.* 156)

Class 5. — — — — —

The addition of another unstressed syllable at the end of the pattern makes this one well suited for the happier features of moral problems, which, it is fair to say, Dr. Johnson occasionally explored.

(a) At a dinner-party which 'fell flat', the host tried to rally the guests, . . . but they answered him with great brevity, and immediately relapsed into their former taciturnity. (R. 101)

(b) A cheerful view of life is reflected in the remarks of a supposed correspondent who pleased herself

with imagining that I should rather see a wedding than a funeral. (R. 51)

(c) In an essay on self-delusion, the echoing of preceding words in the concluding sentence makes effective the contrast between an isolated act of kindness and a general record of vicious behaviour.

. . . and though his whole life is a course of rapacity and avarice, he concludes himself to be tender and liberal, because he has once performed an act of liberality and tenderness. (R. 28)

We now come to the metrical patterns, for rounding off paragraphs, which contain three complete, or nearly complete, quadruple feet, each of a long and three shorts. Whereas the patterns so far quoted have sometimes comprised the second halves of balanced phrases, the following examples will be found more often than not to provide the framework for both parts of the typical Johnsonian balanced phrases or parallelisms. In these instances it is frequently the habit for the metrical patterns to form additional conclusions, or pendants. They are then something like corollaries, epitomizing in epigrammatic manner the outcome of the moral problems under consideration.

It is hardly necessary to add that, as the patterns grow more elaborate, the evidence in favour of a peculiar and definite literary practice becomes more convincing. It is peculiar because it has no parallel in any other author. If objection to definiteness is made on the ground that Dr. Johnson's balanced clauses inevitably result in metrical patterns, reference may be made to dozens of concluding balanced clauses in the essays which do not take this form, besides many hundreds of others throughout the writing.

Class 6. — — — — —

(a) The essayist discourses on the dangers inherent in studying

expositions of morals when style is concentrated upon, rather than substance. A paragraph concludes thus:

... and may enable himself to criticize with judgement, and dispute with subtlety, while the chief use of his volumes is unthought of, his mind is unaffected, and his life is unreformed. (R. 87)

It is evident that the warning in the corollary is intended to become more impressive by being put into metrical form. A disdainful toss of the head would be the author's natural accompaniment to this cadence.

(b) A description of a vicious moralist who harms those in close contact with him, but not his more distant acquaintances.

... Admiration begins where acquaintance ceases; and his favourers are distant, but his enemies at hand. (R. 77)

Another corollary.

(c) In an essay on the follies of the rich, a paragraph concludes:

... or sinking into languor and disease for want of something to actuate their bodies or exhilarate their minds. (*Adv.* 111)

The agility of the metre helps to betoken the contrast between a life of activity and one of sluggish affluence.

(d) A paragraph in an essay on tragedy and comedy ends:

... we might have been more interested in the distresses of his [Shakespeare's] heroes, had we not been so frequently diverted by the jokes of his buffoons. (R. 156)

Class 7. — — — — —

(a) Remarks in justification of seemingly pointless scientific investigations end:

... for all that is great was at first little, and rose to its present bulk by gradual accessions and accumulated labours. (R. 83)

The metre assists the impression of scientific progress being made by a succession of patient steps.

(b) A rather similar reflection is made in an essay on the desirability of enterprise; but here the jaunty metre is used to simulate a spirit of optimism.

... and of every honest endeavour, it is certain that, however unsuccessful, it will be at last rewarded. (R. 129)

(c) There is also the same method at work in an essay which concludes with remarks on disappointed hopes. The metre is used to cast a spotlight on the one hopeful aspect of the picture.

... but the time comes at last, in which life has no more promise, in which happiness can be drawn only from recollection, and virtue will be all that we can recollect with pleasure. (R. 41)

Again a corollary.

(d) A description of a society of virtuosos of strange eccentricities and even stranger moral characters.

... a select company of curious men, who met once a week to exultate their studies and compare their acquisitions. (R. 177)

As in some previous examples, the metre is used here to intensify the writer's attitude of contempt.

(e) Scorn and satire are again the prompters of the use of a metrical pattern in an essay which reproves slothful loungers,

who are more easily engaged by any conversation, than such as may rectify their notions or enlarge their comprehensions. (R. 178)

(f) Use of the metre for the culmination of a description of an utterly pessimistic philosophy shows how adaptable Dr. Johnson could make it.

The world, in its best state, is nothing more than a larger assembly of beings, combining to counterfeit happiness which they do not feel, employing every art and contrivance to embellish life, and to hide their real condition from the eyes of one another. (Adv. 120)

Class 8. — — — — —

(a) A biographer who does no more than provide a chronological review is scornfully characterized as merely producing

a formal and studied narrative, begun with his pedigree, and ended with his funeral. (R. 60)

(b) A family is waiting for a fortune to be left to it by some wealthy aunts. Pending the aunts' death, they take stock of the degree of luxury displayed by their neighbours,

that we might, when the hour of affluence should come, be able to eclipse all their splendour and surpass all their magnificence. (R. 73)

The opulence of phrase is consistent with the imagined opportunities for parade.

Class 9. — — — — —

The extension of the metrical patterns to greater length, covering as many as fourteen and fifteen syllables, improves their buoyant quality and thus makes them increasingly suitable for lively contexts. This kind of use would doubtless have been considerably greater if Dr. Johnson's views on moral questions had been more sunny. Nevertheless, a few of the remaining examples, like the two just quoted, have a streak of humour in their satire which brings them near to levity.

(a) Farcical circumstances in a play intended to be a tragedy are described as surely sufficient to awaken the most torpid risibility. (*R.* 125)

(b) It is asserted that a poet is not qualified to be one by [the use of] traditional imagery, and hereditary similes, by readiness of rhyme, and volubility of syllables. (*Life of Cowley*, § 60)

There could be no greater volubility of syllables than these galloping words. At the same time, they express the essayist's scorn for merely mechanical poetry. Sound was never more surely married to sense.

(c) An essay on cunning has this epigrammatic opening sentence (a place where metrical patterns are occasionally found):

Whatever is useful or honourable will be desired by many who never can obtain it; and that which cannot be obtained when it is desired, artifice or folly will be diligent to counterfeit. (*I.* 92)

The satire of the concluding words is given additional point by the liveliness of the metre.

Class 10. — — — — —

(a) Man is represented as being naturally imitative and unenterprising. Those few who are exceptions are apt to fall away from their adventurousness and to

prefer the equal and steady satisfaction of security before the frolics of caprice and the honours of adventure. (*R.* 135)

Once again, sound for sense; and effective contrast.

(b) An elaborate simile, which compares safety and diversion respectively with kinds of people, concludes thus:

Such is the difference between great and amiable characters: with protectors we are safe; with companions we are happy. (R. 89)

Another corollary.

(c) There are some means, it is said, by which singular and outstanding efficiency can avoid arousing its usual jealousy,

and by which, though kindness is not gained, at least envy is averted. (Adv. 131)
The brisk metre suits the slick contrast.

(d) A man entering late into public life has difficulty in overcoming shyness and diffidence, but he eventually succeeds,

and adds the gracefulness of ease to the dignity of merit. (R. 159)

(e) In an essay on idleness this pattern is effectively employed in sharpening the concluding point of an epigrammatic pronouncement.

Idleness is a silent and peaceful quality, that neither raises envy by ostentation nor hatred by opposition; and therefore nobody is busy to censure or detect it. (I. 31)

Class II. — — — — —

(a) The essay draws to a close with doleful words which are only partly redeemed by the hopeful sentiment enshrined in the final and metrical phrase. These last words have a lilt about them which enables the reader to be encouraged in the news that life, although it is inscrutable, has the chance of happiness at the end of it.

The only thought, therefore, on which we can repose with comfort, is that which presents to us the care of Providence, whose eye takes in the whole of things, and under whose direction all involuntary errors will terminate in happiness. (Adv. 107)

(b) A supposed correspondent recounts a series of depressing experiences. A paragraph ends:

Idleness exposed me to melancholy, and life began to languish in motionless indifference. (R. 133)

At first impression, this may seem to be merely a further instance of possible incongruity. But it must be admitted that the metrical pattern is deftly used to stimulate the reader's imagination of a soul adrift.

The practice of metrical endings, taken as a whole, can be regarded as advantageous to Dr. Johnson's prose style. Paragraphs are rounded off with greater forcefulness and more polished artistry than if it had not been adopted. The desirable feature of variety in rhythm is strengthened. Many passages in the moral essays roll on magnificently in swelling Johnsonian periods. A succession of weighty sentences is often happily relieved by the sharp quickening of the pace at the end of a topic. The preceding classification of examples of metrical patterns may give an undue impression of a literary mode being overdone. This is hardly so. The excess is not gross, though there are sometimes two or even three paragraphs having metrical endings in the same essay. The total number of obvious instances of such endings in the essays is considerably more than double that of the examples quoted above. They are much the most frequent in the moral essays, where the atmosphere is congenial; but they are not infrequent in other prose-writings.

Although we may be inclined to think that a tripping metre is inappropriate to conclusions on very serious subjects, Dr. Johnson certainly displayed skill in employing standard metrical endings for widely different circumstances. The flexibility of prose helped him in this respect. Moreover, some of the tripping metres, even in poetry, have been found suitable for dramatic as well as frivolous verse. Undoubtedly, some of the longer patterns seem to have too much of a sing-song quality for prose, even though they are mostly used as the framework of parallelisms. But a dash of poetical feeling is not so much out of harmony with the moral essays as might be supposed. A considerable amount of imaginative sensibility is noticeable, in particular the extensive use of imagery.

It may be justifiably suspected that part of the object of using metrical endings was to brighten the style, as well as to embellish it. The sudden changes in rhythm in fact succeed in stimulating the reader's attention; and, where they are specifically intended to intensify contrasts, they are well warranted. Nevertheless, the patterns are too standardized, and they tend to break in on the rhetorical prose so suddenly as to be a little inartistic. They may be thought to be used mechanically, with an air of self-consciousness. Yet he had a high opinion of the unaffected structure of sentences in other authors. When reading the *Rambler* an impression is sometimes raised of a dignified old gentleman becoming aware of an excessive dignity in his conversation and breaking out in a quip or epigram. But it is hardly fair to disparage Dr. Johnson's prose merely on the ground that analysis indicates that it is mechanical. The question for the critic is whether the mechanical methods are obtrusive.

The point whether Dr. Johnson used the metrical patterns consciously or not can probably be settled as a result of scrutiny of the examples quoted

above. Frequent use of similar patterns for similar objects is highly suggestive; and sometimes the inclusion of seemingly superfluous words in a metrical scheme is indicative of planning. A notable factor in the evidence is that the metrical patterns only occur at the ends of paragraphs; and at the end of some six epigrammatic opening sentences to paragraphs, where the same kind of effect is intended. But, in case this kind of evidence is insufficient, the matter can almost certainly be settled by comparison of the text of the first edition of the *Rambler* with that of the revised editions. Such comparison proves that Dr. Johnson expended special attention on revising the conclusions to his paragraphs. There are several instances where a metrical ending is substituted in the revised text for a non-metrical one. It is enough to quote one instance. A paragraph in the first edition ended: 'by any conversation than that by which their notions may be rectified, or their comprehensions enlarged' (*R.* 178). This was changed to: 'by any conversation than such as may rectify their notions or enlarge their comprehensions'.

It may be well to add a few remarks with the object of putting the above-described rhythmical features into relation with some others in the moral essays of Dr. Johnson. It would be misleading to imply that the metrical patterns are the only rhythmical endings; and still more so to imply that the rhythmical endings constitute the sole individualized rhythmical feature. Many of the concluding passages in essays have rhythms that are both graceful and varied, though not falling into any of the obvious metrical or balanced ones. Dr. Johnson has a more fluent style for the anecdotal type of essay, where the moral promptings are only latent. Plenty of happy instances of this kind of writing could be given. As good as any is the description of a lady who had been deceived by flattery into believing that she was bewitching: 'She glittered at court, fluttered in the park, and talked aloud in the front-box; but after a thousand experiments of her charms, was at last convinced that she had been flattered, and that her glass was honester than her maid' (*R.* 189). The whole concluding paragraph flows with the kind of undulating rhythm that makes description pleasant reading. The non-metrical endings to paragraphs are as notable in accommodating sound to sense as the metrical ones have been seen to be. One of Dr. Johnson's most impressive prose passages, in No. 159 of the *Rambler*, concludes: 'and that the utmost which we can reasonably hope or fear, is to fill the vacant hour with prattle, and be forgotten'. The reader may not find the sentiments of such a dismal philosophy congenial to him, but he will scarcely withhold his admiration from the exemplary cadence. In the literal sense of that word, the voice falls and dies away. Another essay has a paragraph on the miseries of infirmity, which tells us, in a gruesome

conclusion, that the sufferers 'will lose all their power under the gripe of time, relax with numbness, and totter with debility' (*R.* 48). It is almost possible to hear the poor creatures quivering. A less dramatic example displays equal skill in an inconspicuous way. 'What is read with delight is commonly retained, because pleasure always secures attention: but the books which are consulted by occasional necessity, and perused with impatience, seldom leave any traces on the mind' (*I.* 74). The contrast between happy, profitable activity and the evanescent results of merely transient interest is aptly insinuated in these concluding words to an essay.

It is not practicable to remark here on the prevalence of rhythmical features throughout most of the moral essays; and, in any case, the outcome of such an exploit would be questionable. Only the more definite structural features of prose rhythm impress the majority of readers alike. There is a particular one of these which may have a brief reference here, as being readily identifiable. It is found chiefly in concluding paragraphs to essays. Indeed, it often occupies the whole of a short concluding paragraph. The basis of it is a regular succession of stresses in pairs of balanced clauses. A stress at the end of each clause is specially noticeable. The reason for this type of rhythmical sequence is that, when Dr. Johnson expressed himself as a result of intense thought, his antithetical habit of mind took charge. He evidently felt that he could be most persuasive when he let loose a battery of contrasted, or at least parallel, clauses.

This particular type of rhythm is, then, normally used for emphatic diction, where the author desires to sum up his argument in trenchant terms; and it frequently suggests that he is animated by emotion. The structure of this emphatic rhythm is naturally much looser and less standardized than that of the metrical patterns which have been under discussion. There, in a distinct branch of the subject of prose rhythm, the patterns are capable, as the word 'metrical' suggests, of mathematical measurement; and the number of words involved in the pattern is small. Here, the position and number of the stresses is much more variable; and the number of words involved is about five or ten times as many, at least. The rhythm depends on a comprehensive design of repeated stresses in which words, and even clauses, are elements, rather than a precise pattern of a few long and short syllables.

One of Dr. Johnson's favourite tricks for enforcing his meaning, in these pairs of clauses of mounting urgency, is the use of the same word in both the clauses. This echoing of a word, combined with the antithetical scheme, is highly effective in hammering the points home with true Johnsonian vigour. For instance, the last sentence of an essay includes this pair of clauses: 'and that those who have learned vice by his example, should by his example be taught amendment' (*R.* 31).

Three full-length examples of the emphatic rhythm are appended, each of which comprises a whole concluding paragraph to an essay. They are printed so as to show the clauses divided into pairs, corresponding to the parallelism of thought.

Against Idleness (R. 134)

The certainty that life cannot be long,
and the probability that it will be much shorter than nature allows,

ought to awaken every man to the active prosecution
of whatever he is desirous to perform.

It is true, that no diligence can ascertain success;
death may intercept the swiftest career;

but he who is cut off in the execution of an honest undertaking,
has at least the honour of falling in his rank,

and has fought the battle,
though he missed the victory.

Simple Humour (R. 188)

Such are the arts by which cheerfulness is promoted,
and sometimes friendship established;

arts, which those who despise them should not rigorously blame,
except when they are practised at the expense of innocence;

for it is always necessary to be loved,
but not always necessary to be revered.

Loss of Time (I. 14)

To put every man in possession of his own time
and rescue the day from this succession of usurpers,

is beyond my power,
and beyond my hope.

Yet perhaps some stop might be put to this unmerciful persecution,
if all would seriously reflect,

that whoever pays a visit that is not desired,
or talks longer than the hearer is willing to attend,

is guilty of an injury which he cannot repair,
and takes away that which he cannot give.

Study of rhythmical features is specially interesting in a famous author who is even better known as a talker. Numberless admirers of Dr. Johnson

must have wished that they could hear him talk. Boswell, although a more accurate recorder than anyone has a right to expect, could not reproduce the conversation *verbatim*, compelled, as he doubtless was, to rely partly on memory and partly on surreptitious jottings. But such spontaneous, individual, and deeply felt passages as those just quoted provide us with a means of closely representing Dr. Johnson's authentic intonations. The reminiscences of several of his friends vouch for the fact that he spoke as he wrote, especially as he wrote in the *Rambler*. These foregoing examples of a notable characteristic in his style may, then, be left to speak for themselves, without further comment.

Note. Additional examples of emphatic rhythm, at the end of essays, may be found in *R.* 19, 31, 50, 64, 66, 68, 69, 79, 85, 104, 111, 112, 128, 136, 137, 141, 145, 158, 166, 172, 180, 200, 207; *Adv.* 107; *I.* 34, 51, 72, 74. Other examples in *R.* 20, 25, 32, 48, 53, 54, 56, 58, 63, 67, 68, 70, 74, 77, 78, 98, 104, 111, 137, 146, 175; *I.* 14, 43, 44, 84; in fact, in most of the essays dealing with moral problems.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

THE DATE OF *ROMEO AND JULIET*

THE date of *Romeo and Juliet* is still an open question. The first quarto appeared in 1597; but some critics place the tragedy, or at least an early version of it, as far back as 1591. The Nurse's reference to an earthquake eleven years before¹ would point to this date, for in 1580 an earthquake was actually felt in England. On the other hand, the allusion to the 'first and second cause' of a quarrel² would suggest a later year; for Saviolo's *Practise*, which discusses the 'causes' of a duel, was published in 1595. The style of the play, moreover, very similar to that of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595),³ supports this date; and, furthermore, Weever's reference to the popularity of Romeo as a character seems to have been written at about this time. The first quarto describes the play as having been performed by 'the L. of *Hunsdon* his Seruants'; and the use of that title shows that the tragedy must have been on the stage between 22 July 1596 and the following April.⁴ Of course, it may have been written as early as 1591 and extensively revised in 1595 or 1596; but the evidence is inconclusive.

Romeo and Juliet is full of astrological references;⁵ and these references are linked to the days of the week and month and to the phases of the moon: indeed, Shakespeare marks the passing of time with unusual clarity and precision. The play begins on Sunday with a brawl followed by the Capulet entertainment where the lovers meet, and, about midnight, the famous 'balcony' scene. On Monday the lovers are married, Tybalt killed, and Romeo's banishment decreed. On Tuesday Romeo's exile begins, and Juliet promises to marry Paris, and takes the potion. On Wednesday she is found apparently dead; Romeo returns to Verona; and, that night, both lovers commit suicide in the Capulet tomb.⁶ On Monday Lady Capulet and the Nurse in a long, and otherwise rather pointless, dialogue emphasize the fact that Juliet was born 'On Lammas-eve', i.e. 31 July o.s., and that her birthday is 'A fortnight and odd days' from the time of speaking. A fortnight would bring the date back to 17 July; and the 'odd days'⁷ would bring it either three days farther back to 14 July or

¹ *Romeo and Juliet*, I. iii. 22 et seq.

² *Ibid.* II. iv. 23.

³ See the present writer, 'The Date of *A Midsummer Nights Dreame*', *M.L.N.* lii (1938), 266-8.

⁴ On this date, see *Romeo and Juliet*, orig. Rolfe ed., p. 12.

⁵ See the present writer, 'Shakespeare's "Star-Crossed Lovers"', *R.E.S.* xv (1939), 16 et seq.

⁶ On the time-analysis, corrected from Daniel, see the orig. Rolfe ed., p. 219.

⁷ Schmidt's *Lexicon*, in accordance with the context of this passage, defines 'odd' as 'not even, not divisible into two equal whole numbers'.

five days back to 12 July. If it were seven days before Lady Capulet would surely have said three weeks. Thus the play would seem to have been set in a year when Monday fell on either 12 July or 14 July. The former was Monday in 1591 and in 1596; and the latter was Monday in 1595. According to the Julian calendar then used in England, moreover, these are the only three dates in the decade of the 1590s that would fit these circumstances.

The phases of the moon, implied or stated here and there in the text, supply further evidence that should determine which of these dates is preferable. On Sunday, in the 'balcony' scene, Juliet is 'bescreen'd in night'; and 'mask of night' covers her face; and it is 'dark night'. Nevertheless Romeo can recognize her from below, and he swears 'by yonder blessed moon'. These passages are consistent only with a thin old or new moon; and, as the scene takes place near morning, the moon must be in its final quarter. This inference is supported by the allusion to 'the pale reflex of Cynthia's brow'—or 'bow', as some critics prefer—early on Tuesday morning;¹ and apparently on Thursday morning in the graveyard just before dawn there is no moon at all. In short, all this consistently implies the last stages of a waning moon, with a new moon invisible on Thursday or Friday. If Monday was 12 July, then there should be a new moon 15 or 16 July; if Monday were 14 July, then there should be a new moon 17 or 18 July; and this necessary relation of lunar phases to the days of the week and of the month should serve as a significant check on the three possible dates already found.

Taking 708.75 hours as the synodic period of the moon, one can compute the lunations for July 1591, 1595, and 1596 from the solar eclipses of 12 April 1582 O.S.² and 2 October 1605 N.S.³ In 1591 the new moon occurred on 11 July, i.e. on Sunday night; and, consequently, it is impossible that Romeo could swear by 'yonder' moon just before dawn; for on that night no moon at all would have been visible. In 1595 the new moon occurred on 24 July; and this would mean that on 13 July, eleven days before, the 'balcony' scene would have been flooded with a moon almost full, and the graveyard scene would have had almost a quarter moon. There remains only July 1596; and this fits perfectly; for there was a new moon, and therefore no light before dawn on Thursday, 15 July O.S., during the graveyard scene; and on the Sunday night preceding, i.e. 11 July, there was a thin crescent of the old moon until late after midnight for the 'balcony' scene. Thus the play is astronomically dated 11–15 July 1596, very much as Dante's *Divine Comedy* is placed in Holy Week 1300. Significantly enough, moreover,

¹ *Romeo and Juliet*, I. v. 20.

² Harvey, *Astronomical Discourse* (London, 1583), p. 56.

³ Von Oppolzer, *Canon* (Vienna, 1887), p. 268.

this would bring the unlucky thirteenth of the month in the ill-starred Tuesday when Romeo's banishment begins and when Juliet is forced to consent to marry Paris.

All this can hardly be coincidence; for, given the day of the week, the mathematical probability that it would by accident fit both the changes of the moon and also the two possible days of the month can be calculated as one chance out of 155. As none of this material appears in Shakespeare's sources, one can hardly escape the conclusion that he deliberately gave the play this definite date; and the reason for his doing so is not difficult to find. *Romeo and Juliet* is full of astrological reference that depends more or less on the calendar; almanacs were common reading-matter; and, when Shakespeare consulted his almanac, he naturally made the dates and the astronomy conform. This definite fixing of the plot by year and day suggests that the tragedy was written, or at least extensively revised, in 1596; for Shakespeare would naturally consult a current almanac: he would hardly trouble to compute—even if he knew how—the week-days and lunations of a year ahead; and the quarto of 1597 precludes a later date. Possibly a version of the play existed in 1591;¹ but the evidence scattered up and down the text points to 1595-6; and the astronomy clearly implies the latter year—about the time when we learn from the title-page of the first quarto that it was actually on the stage.

JOHN W. DRAPER

MILTON'S SONNET ON HIS 'LATE ESPOUSED SAINT'

BEFORE Professor W. R. Parker's article on 'Milton's Last Sonnet' appeared in *R.E.S.* [xxi (1945), 235-8], it had for over two centuries been assumed that the sonnet referred to the poet's second wife, Katherine Woodcock. In that article, however, Professor Parker argued that no reason at all could be adduced for relating it to her, whereas the poem itself provided evidence—weighty, if not final and conclusive—that its subject was the first wife, Mary Powell. This impressed the editor of *Notes and Queries*² and also Dr. F. E. Hutchinson (in *Milton and the English Mind*); but Professor T. O. Mabbott was sceptical: in the light of the nuncupative will he could not believe Milton 'likely to be sentimental about his first wife'.³

The traditional view had been put forward, as Professor Parker said, in mere 'flat statements without evidence or explanation'; and his attack upon

¹ This seems improbable; for the play shows a correlation of tempo with character and humour in its text as a whole that suggests a date after *Richard II* (1595).

² *N. & Q.* clxxxix (1945), 111.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 239.

it has shown the need for a reasoned defence. The purpose of this note is to supply that need.

First, let us have the sonnet before us.

Methought I saw my late espoused Saint
 Brought to me like *Alcestis* from the grave,
 Whom *Joves* great Son to her glad Husband gave,
 Rescu'd from death by force though pale and faint.
 Mine as whom washt from spot of child-bed taint,
 Purification in the old Law did save,
 And such, as yet once more I trust to have
 Full sight of her in Heaven without restraint,
 Came vested all in white, pure as her mind:
 Her face was vail'd, yet to my fancied sight,
 Love, sweetness, goodness, in her person shin'd
 So clear, as in no face with more delight.
 But O as to embrace me she enclin'd
 I wak'd, she fled, and day brought back my night.

Professor Parker used two main arguments. The first was that since his wife appeared before the poet in his dream *as though* she had been saved from death in childbirth, the probability is that she had not in fact survived the period of purification laid down in Leviticus xii. 5. This was true of Mary Powell, who died three days after her daughter was born, but not true of Katherine Woodcock, who lived for three and a half months after the birth of her daughter. His second argument was based on ll. 7 and 8, in which Milton says that he hopes to have full sight of his wife once more in heaven. In the dream he did not see her face; and hence, Professor Parker contended, 'unless one wishes to call this careless writing and assume that the poet does not mean what he says, the lines cannot refer literally to Katherine Woodcock, because there is not the slightest reason for believing that Milton ever saw his second wife before his blindness. If he never had "full sight" of her, he could not have it "once more".'

In rebuttal, let us start by inquiring why it had for so long been assumed without question that the sonnet concerned Katherine Woodcock. Surely it was not, as Professor Parker affirmed, because Elijah Fenton said so and others echoed him parrot-fashion. It was because the poem itself appears to say so in its very first line. It is the natural thing to take 'late espoused' as meaning 'recently married', and 'Saint' as 'one of the elect', 'a saintly person', who after death becomes a saint in heaven. Milton's third wife survived him; his first had been married for ten years before she died: only the second could have been seen in a dream after her death as recently married, for she died in the fifteenth month of her married life.

It is plainly a serious flaw in Professor Parker's case that he turned a blind

eye to such an obvious and easy interpretation as this (the one, surely, which springs immediately to most readers' minds), and that he gave instead a forced explanation of the opening line as though it were the only one possible. 'The word "late"', he asserted, 'is an indefinite time reference; it can mean four years, or one. His late wife is now a "saint" because she is a soul in heaven', like the Marchioness of Winchester in Milton's *Epitaph* (ll. 61 and 71). Study of a concordance shows that (leaving this place aside) adverbial 'late' = 'recently' occurs seventeen times in Milton's verse (much more often than any other use of the word) and that 'late' = 'dead' does not occur there at all. This *may* be just a matter of chance. Yet it can hardly be denied that 'late-espoused Saint' is a much more natural grouping than 'late espoused-Saint'; and it finds an exact parallel in *Paradise Lost*, x. 436-7: 'the late/Heav'n-banish'd Host'.

We must conclude, therefore, that the first line establishes a strong probability in favour of identification with Katherine Woodcock; and it only remains to show that the rest of the sonnet accords with that identification. In doing so we may find it of interest to reconstruct, if we can, something of the making of the poem.

It is a dream-construction. Even in the dream Milton is aware that his wife has died; and so when he seems to see her before him he thinks of Alcestis restored to Admetus from the grave. The analogy suggests itself imperatively, for both women were supremely virtuous and loving wives. But Alcestis was brought back by the might of Hercules, and in his company: Milton's wife returns alone. What 'force', then, can have rescued her from death, 'though pale and faint'? Must the analogy break down at this point? Yet it is a good analogy: his dream-wife is silent like Alcestis in the play; like her she is veiled; and if Alcestis gave her life that her husband might live, his 'Saint' risked hers in childbirth that Milton might live in her child. So, with childbirth in mind, he persists in his effort to work out the analogy.

At the end of Euripides' tragedy we learn that, though Alcestis has been restored to her husband, subsequent purification will be necessary to release her from her consecration to the nether gods (*Alcestis*, 1144-6). The recollection of this may have helped Milton, dwelling on childbirth, to think of 'purification in the old Law' as instrumental in his wife's apparent release. Before Katherine's death the days of purification prescribed in Leviticus had been fulfilled: had she lived in Old Testament times she would have been held to be preserved from the dangers attendant upon childbirth. Under 'the old Law', then, she might indeed have returned to him from the shadow of the grave, if purification had 'force' to ward off the powers of evil. So to some extent the poet allows himself to indulge that fancy.

But cleansing from pollution was the chief effect of 'purification in the old Law'; and it is his wife's purity that Milton is most concerned to stress. If in life she had spot or blemish it could only be 'child-bed taint', and that had, as it were, been washed away. In the dream she comes in vestments so white that they are 'pure as her mind'; her very person radiates love, sweetness, and goodness. And it is this purity, he implies, that has enabled her to reach beyond the grave this once to his 'fancied sight'.

So far as we know Milton never saw his wife Katherine in the flesh. This, then, is the first time he has 'seen' her, and he entertains no hope that the seeming visit will be repeated. In heaven, however, he hopes to see her 'once more', and then to have 'full sight' of her 'without restraint', for he will not be blind and will be able to see her face. This first experience has been a foretaste of that, for her inner beauty shone in her person 'So clear, as in no face with more delight', and even in heaven itself she cannot appear more saintly. Hence he speaks of having 'full sight' of her 'once more', though then 'without restraint'.

As he had never actually seen his wife, the picture he forms of her in his dream is featureless. And when he imagines that she bends down to kiss him and so to reveal her face, his fancy cannot cheat so well as one might wish, and he is tolled back from her to his sole self. That we are reminded of the conclusion of Keats's *Ode* is not fortuitous, for both poems are examples of willing surrender to but partially directed idealizations of fancy; yet it is typical of Milton's habitual rectitude of mind that even in the dream state he will not endow the visionary figure with a face supplied by guess-work.

We can see, then, that the detail of the poem bears out the evidence of its opening line that Katherine Woodcock is its subject. Furthermore, following upon what has just been said, it can be shown in a word that Mary Powell must be ruled out of consideration altogether. The dream was caused by the poet's longing for his beloved wife's companionship, for the presence of her saintly nature, which most shines in the face. If the fancied sight of Mary Powell's face would have done anything to allay that longing, he could have conjured it up again and again—if not at will, at least in such a dream as this. The face, however, remains veiled, and he has no hope of seeing it on this side of the grave.

Katherine he had never seen; and hence in special measure the sense of miracle the poem imparts. Katherine's face he never saw, even in the dream; and hence much of the pathos the poem holds: for we know the hunger Milton felt in his blindness for the sight of 'human face divine' (*Paradise Lost*, iii. 44), and whose face can he have more yearned to see than that of his 'late espoused Saint'?

FITZROY PYLE

MATTHEW ARNOLD AND THE *SPECTATOR*

PROFESSOR L. TRILLING has described Matthew Arnold's Preface to the 1853 edition of his poems as, in effect, an answer to A. H. Clough's review of his previous volume.¹ But Clough was not alone in his age in holding the opinions expressed in that review. In writing the Preface, Arnold was evidently thinking of other critics besides him;² and it was a *Spectator* reviewer of a volume by another poet who supplied him with the handiest statement of the opinion he wished to refute. His attempted refutation of it provoked a retort from the *Spectator* which he seems to have had in mind when writing his Preface to the 1854 edition of his poems; and when he published *Merope* (with another Preface) in 1858 the *Spectator* returned to the attack. These exchanges repay attention; reading them, we can see how Arnold's classical doctrines struck a representative cultured contemporary.

Internal evidence makes it fairly certain that the *Spectator's* reviewer of Edwin Arnold's *Poems Narrative and Lyrical* (1853) had six months earlier written the very short notice of *Empedocles on Etna, and Other Poems. By A* (1852).³ He found similar faults in both volumes. With reference to the former, he made the statement which Matthew Arnold set out to refute in his Preface of 1853: 'The poet who would really fix the public attention must leave the exhausted past, and draw his subjects from matters of present import and therefore both of interest and novelty.'⁴

Arnold denied this.

The Poet . . . has in the first place to select an excellent action; and what actions are the most excellent? Those, certainly, which most powerfully appeal to the great primary human affections: to those elementary feelings which subsist permanently in the race, and which are independent of time. These feelings are permanent and the same; that which interests them is permanent and the same also. The modernness or antiquity of an action, therefore, has nothing to do with its fitness for poetical representation; this depends upon its inherent qualities.

Having chosen his great action, the poet must treat it as a whole and not squander his talent in the romantic fashion upon incidental beauties. He will do well to study the ancients, for they can teach him 'the all-importance of the choice of a subject; the necessity of accurate construction; and the subordinate character of expression'. Those who have made such a study benefit by its 'steadying and composing effect upon their judgement'.

¹ *Matthew Arnold* (London, 1939), pp. 146-8.

² See H. W. Garrod, 'Matthew Arnold's 1853 Preface', *R.E.S.* xvii (1941) 310-21.

³ 2 April 1853 and 30 Oct. 1852 respectively.

⁴ Apparently in order to draw attention to what he considered a *non sequitur*, Arnold italicized 'therefore'.

They do not talk of their mission, nor of interpreting their age, nor of the coming Poet; all this, they know, is the mere delirium of vanity; their business is not to praise their age, but to afford to the men who live in it the highest pleasure which they are capable of feeling. If asked to afford this by means of subjects drawn from the age itself, they ask what special fitness the present age has for supplying them: they are told that it is an era of progress, an age commissioned to carry out the great ideas of industrial development and social amelioration. They reply that with all this they can do nothing; that the elements they need for the exercise of their art are great actions, calculated powerfully and delightfully to affect what is permanent in the human soul; that so far as the present age can supply such actions, they will gladly make use of them; but that an age wanting in moral grandeur can with difficulty supply such, and an age of spiritual discomfort with difficulty be powerfully and delightfully affected by them.

The *Spectator* review¹ of the 1853 *Poems* was evidently written by the 'intelligent critic' whom Arnold had quoted in his Preface and whom he now believed to be 'Rentool' (i.e. R. S. Rintoul, the editor) himself.² This critic saw no reason for modifying his judgement of 1852 on Arnold's poetry: 'Mr. Arnold has culture rather than originality.' He was more interested in the Preface than in the poems and devoted to that almost the whole of his unusually long review.

He admitted that it was obvious that an action's 'fitness for poetical representation' depended not upon its date but 'upon its inherent qualities'. But the question at issue between Arnold and himself was, as he saw it, 'whether the poet of the nineteenth century should seek the subjects of his art in the facts he gathers out of ancient Greek books, rather than in the world of his own experience, action, and emotion'. The reviewer maintained

that the poet must seek such subjects as both he and his audience could realize vividly and distinctly, and which dealt with ideas and feelings sufficiently akin to those of our living world, to be not only grasped by an act of intellectual apprehension, but appropriated by an act of moral sympathy. And such subjects we conceived, and still do conceive, are to be found in modern times more easily and more abundantly than in ancient times; not that the question is at all one of dates, but of changes of thought, feeling, and manners, that the lapse of time has brought with it, and also of the destruction and passing away of that ancient life of which fragments indeed have floated down to us, but of which we have the extremest difficulty in forming a full adequate conception, such as alone can satisfy in a poetic representation. . . . Mr. Arnold, attempting to revive Greek poetry, and resolving not to be the Englishman that God has made him, ends in being nothing, neither Greek nor Englishman; and, forgetting that the elemental passions, though not to be confounded with their local and casual modes, yet must be exhibited in some mode, and determining not to represent them in the

¹ 3 Dec. 1853.

² *Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold* (New Haven, 1923), p. 22.

English mode, which he knows and feels, succeeds in representing no human passions at all, but abstract moods of mind if anything.

Finally, the reviewer charged Arnold with escapism, with wishing 'to neglect the work of the world for beautiful dreaming'. Arnold had suggested that the Victorian age was not specially fitted to supply poetical subjects, since it was an age wanting in moral grandeur, an age of spiritual discomfort. The reviewer retorted that such an age

needs more than any other its interpreter, who shall declare its sickness and point out its cure; and that, specially fitted or not to supply poetical subjects, it is here, in the midst of this age, that his Maker has planted him, for the especial purpose, if he really possess poetical faculties, of showing how man conquers circumstances, and is in his own spirit the fountain of beauty and strength and all that makes the elements of poetry. What a mean and cowardly mood it is, this scorn and dislike of one's own time!

Arnold reprinted his Preface 'almost without change' in the 1854 edition of his poems; and he added to it a second, shorter Preface in which he admitted 'the force of much that has been alleged against portions of' its predecessor. But he dismissed the *Spectator's* objection to his 'classing together, as subjects equally belonging to a past time, Oedipus and Macbeth'; and he insisted that he had not wished to limit the poet in his choice of subjects to the period of Greek and Roman antiquity but merely to 'counsel him to choose for his subjects great actions, without regarding to what time they belong'. Replying to another critic, he reaffirmed his belief in the study of classical literature as a corrective to 'our caprice and eccentricity'.

Merope (1858) was intended to exemplify his theories. But he refused to reopen his general defence of them. The new Preface was simply an explanation and justification of his practice in the tragedy which followed.

But the *Spectator* reviewer of *Merope* was very ready to renew the attack.¹

'Wilful man must have his way,' much more wilful poet. Mr. Arnold still maintains that a proper subject for poesy is Classical rather than shall we say Christian times, or beyond any doubt our own times. He proceeds not only to enforce his views in a long and very able preface, but to prove his conviction by his conduct, selecting an ancient Greek story for an English tragedy. It were useless to reopen the discussion on such general points as our want of living knowledge of the ancient world—the great changes that have taken place in religion, opinions, manners, modes of life, involving corresponding change of feeling as to events and even in the exhibition of passion—the enlargement of our information in nature and science, with the consequent difference in the estimate of things. It may not, however, be unprofitable, in criticizing the book, to show how the remarks and treatment of his subject shake the writer's theory

¹ 2 Jan. 1858.

This the reviewer attempted to do in the remainder of his article. A 'choice specimen of . . . argumentation', commented Arnold in a letter to his mother.¹

Arnold's Preface to the 1853 edition of his poems was basically a rejection of romantic subjectivism.² He urged the nineteenth-century poet to choose an 'excellent action' and to subordinate all his talents to the presentation of it. The Greeks would show him how; and they might even provide him with the 'excellent action' itself. If he followed this advice, he would produce a work which would not be a mere allegory of the state of his own mind.

It was not as a romantic that the *Spectator* poetry critic opposed this doctrine. He accepted willingly enough Arnold's view that an 'excellent action' was essential. But whereas Arnold did not expect to find many such actions in contemporary life, the reviewer smelt escapism in any attempt to find them elsewhere. Fundamentally, the men clashed because of their radically different estimates of their age; their debate is a prologue to Arnold's later and greater battle with the *Saturday Review* on the question of British Philistinism.

J. D. JUMP

¹ *Letters of Matthew Arnold 1848-1888* (London, 1895), i. 58.

² See Trilling, *op. cit.*, pp. 148-53.

REVIEWS

Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England. By CHARLES W. JONES. Pp. xiii+232 (Romanesque Literature, vol. I). Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1947; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. \$3.00; 16s. net.

The author seems to have had in mind two purposes: an analysis of the time-references in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and their probable sources, and a study of the earliest English hagiologies in Latin as examples of a literary form. The first would continue his work in his edition of *Bedae Opera de Temporibus* (The Mediaeval Academy of America, Cambridge, Mass., 1943); the second would suitably introduce this new series. The two themes have enough in common to justify publication of essays on both in one volume; but the author goes farther. In five introductory chapters, on 93 pages, he elaborates the proposition stated in his earlier work, that the compilation of chronicles developed from the notes on anniversaries in tables of the Julian calendar, while annals were first entered in the margins of Easter tables; and he leads on to his two topics, mingling a wealth of detailed information with picturesque generalizations and ingenious suggestions in order to present a lively account of seventh and eighth century monastic life and civilization. To the historian, the account is interesting but, in some places, surprisingly steep. The author abandons, as a rule, the clear and factual language of his earlier study on chronology for an impressionistic style, which provides a more graphic medium for his partly conjectural pictures of the working life of a seventh century computist, but is inexact by historical standards, and sometimes leaves his meaning indefinite. 'Gothic saints were Francis and Mary' (p. 51) is a sentence which, even in its context, leaves much to the imagination.

The middle chapter of the five (pp. 31-50) deals with time references in the *Ecclesiastical History*, and here the language is exact, and the subject-matter is interesting to anyone studying Bede's chronology in detail, though hardly to others to whom the rest of the introduction may appeal. Here the author contests the view of Dr. R. L. Poole, in *Studies in Chronology and History* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 38-53, and Sir Frank Stenton, in *Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1943), pp. 72, 129, that Bede's chronology was systematic, and maintains 'that the method of dating employed by Bede will, barring necessary changes, be that of the document on which he is working' (p. 42). With this chapter must be read an Appendix (pp. 161-99) containing a detailed analysis of the time references themselves. The author's explanation of the evidence is more satisfactory and complete than Dr. Poole's or Sir Frank Stenton's, and is more constructive than Dr. W. Levison's criticism of their conclusions in *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 265-79. But his essential points are probably sounder than some of his assumptions, and one's faith in his treatment of authorities is not strengthened by his statement that Stenton 'would alter the text to make Poole's thesis tenable' (p. 170), when Stenton refers to an alteration which exists in a manuscript (*Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 129).

The introductory chapters are followed by translations of the Whitby *Life of St. Gregory* and Felix's *Life of St. Guthlac* (pp. 97-160). The publication of translations, unaccompanied by a critical edition of the text, is inadvisable when the work will be of interest to scholars only; it is unfortunate when printed copies of the text are as rare as is the *Life of St. Guthlac*; and this translation is misleading and inaccurate, as one finds in going no farther than sections 1 and 4 of the *Life of St. Guthlac*. The arrangement of the book could have been improved. The chapter on time references, which has little connexion, if any, with the translations, is separated from its appendix by chapters on hagiology and the translations. While reference notes to the translations appear conveniently on each page, both references and explanatory notes to the introduction appear at the end of the book, and are numbered serially through each chapter; but the number of the chapter does not appear on each page in either text or notes.

W. S. ANGUS

Everyman. A Comparative Study of Texts and Sources. By HENRY DE VOCHT. Pp. 228. (Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama. New Series: Twentieth Volume.) Louvain: Ch. Uystpruyst, for the Librairie Universitaire, 1947. No price given.

'This study is born from a deep-rooted love of accuracy tantalized by a lifelong wonder when Truth will finally come into her right.' With these words Professor de Vocht reopens the controversy about the priority of *Everyman* to its Flemish counterpart *Elckerlyc*, or vice versa, which seemed to have been decided in favour of the latter play since the principal champion of *Everyman*, the late Dr. K. H. de Raaf,¹ publicly recanted in 1934. Dr. de Raaf's conversion, as stated by himself, was brought about by the articles which Professors Manly and Wood contributed to the American journal *Modern Philology* in 1910. Wood's conclusion was that *Elckerlyc* is, as a whole, artistically superior to *Everyman*; that the Flemish play is theologically correct and remarkably consistent and logical, whereas the English morality is faulty in language and metre, wrong in theology, inapt in its biblical allusions, and full of inconsistencies; the corollary being that the better play is the original. Later contributions to the discussion have mainly tended in the same direction.

This judgement Professor de Vocht would almost totally reverse. He admits that, from a purely metrical point of view (including rhyming technique and stanzaic structure), the Flemish morality is superior to the English. On the other hand, he claims that in everything that concerns the clear and unambiguous expression of religious truth as distinct from merely formal excellence, *Elckerlyc* remains far below *Everyman*. The author of the English play he takes to have been a priest or theologian, mainly intent on imparting sound doctrine. The Flemish version he believes to have been the work of one of those men who practised poetry as a 'trade' in one of the numerous 'Chambers of Rhetoric' (p. 134); his solicitude for the outward form led him into 'inconsistency and inadequateness

¹ See his critical edition of *Den Spyghel der Salicheyt van Elckerlyc* (Groningen diss., 1897).

in the teaching of, and the referring to, things of faith and religion', besides making the play 'hardly intelligible on [*sic*] several places' (p. 141). Like Wood and others, he bases his final verdict on the assumption that superiority means priority; only this time it is the unknown English author who benefits.

To prove his point, Professor de Vocht subjects the text of *Elckerlyc* to a searching analysis, in the course of which all its imperfections, real or imaginary, are laid bare with uncompromising severity. To the reader of his treatise it soon becomes evident that its author has cast himself for the part, not of an impartial judge, but of a public prosecutor. No detail escapes him that can possibly be construed to the accused's disadvantage; page after page new evidence of bungling incompetence is unearthed, till one wonders how anyone could ever have thought of *Elckerlyc* as one of the glories of Dutch literature. Unless—a suspicion begins to grow upon one that the critic in his zeal has overshot his mark, and that the effect produced is one of confusion rather than of clarification.

There is only space to discuss two or three instances. According to Professor de Vocht the dependence of the Flemish text on that of *Everyman* is 'apodictically proved' by some of the names of the personages (p. 53). About a dozen pages are devoted to a demonstration that *Duecht* and *Kennisse* in *Elckerlyc* are mistranslations of *Good dedes* and *Knowledge*, the latter to be taken in the sense of acknowledgement of sin. But Verdam's *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* registers these very meanings for the two Dutch words; and as to the Flemish dramatist's alleged ignorance of true Catholic doctrine, a very different impression is to be gained from a paper by L. C. Michels, now Professor in the Roman Catholic University of Nijmegen, published in the *Transactions* of the Fourteenth 'Nederlandsche Philologencongres' (1931), 47–50. The author of *Elckerlyc* is blamed for writing (l. 30): 'Myn puer *gheloue* is al vergheten': 'though men are sinners, they keep their faith' (de Vocht); the *Everyman* text (l. 51), far more aptly (according to de Vocht), has '*Charyte* they all do clene forgete'. But what about ll. 29–30: 'My *lawe* that I shewed . . . they forgot clene'? *Everyman* is praised (on p. 69) for making Death introduce the theme of the appeal to companions, &c. (l. 141), *Elckerlyc* blamed for having no parallel at this point. But there seems to be no reason why Death should offer such advice; it is one of a number of instances where the author of *Everyman* anticipated the course of events and thereby impaired the logical sequence of the dialogue, a feature which supports the view that *Elckerlyc*, not *Everyman*, is the original.¹ On p. 86 the author of *Elckerlyc* is blamed for speaking of Christ's 'pelgrimagie stranghe' (l. 532), on the ground that, though man's death is a cruel pilgrimage, Christ's was not, as He knew that it would be followed by the Harrowing of Hell and by His Resurrection. Is this Catholic doctrine?

In his last chapter Professor de Vocht argues that *Everyman* 'is deeply rooted

¹ See my article on *Elckerlyc—Everyman* in *English Studies*, xxiii (1941), 1–9. It is one of a number of publications on the subject that Professor de Vocht does not seem to know (or, as he himself would put it, seems to 'ignore'), others being Prof. Michels's paper mentioned above, and two articles on the famous *crux roeyken—rodde* in *Tijdschrift voor Taal en Letteren*, xiv (1926), 1–6, and *De Nieuwe Taalgids*, xx (1926), 258–9. It is curious, too, that he nowhere mentions Dr. de Raaf's change of opinion.

in the literature of England of the XIVth and the XVth century', no such close affiliations with the literature of its own country being apparently demonstrable in the case of *Elckerlyc*. If he had read Dr. G. Kazemier's articles in *De Nieuwe Taalgids*, xxxiv. 87-96, 116-128, he might have come to a different conclusion.

Such is Professor de Vocht's *parti pris* against the work of his late fifteenth-century countryman that, in spite of its having won the first prize at an Antwerp *landjuweel*, he assumes that it 'must have been a failure for the general public' (p. 143), and somewhat spitefully observes, eighteen pages farther on: 'At any rate the man responsible for *Elckerlyc* did secure success, and *his success has lasted far too long*' (reviewer's italics). Can any really valuable contribution to the subject be made in the captious spirit that pervades this whole treatise?

R. W. ZANDVOORT

The Palmerin Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction. By MARY PATCHELL. Pp. xiii+157 (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature 166). New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. \$2.50; 14s. net.

This is a painstaking and workmanlike study of the subject. The *Palmerin* series of four immense novels of chivalry, in their turn part of the numerous progeny of *Amadis de Gaula*, are samples of the genre which was so extraordinarily popular in sixteenth-century Spain, and was known in a general way by its influence all over western Europe. It was also known specifically to the English reading public by translations of, among others, these *Palmerin* romances. The translation, mediocre in quality, was the work of Anthony Munday, and appeared between the years 1581 and 1595, in several volumes. Miss Patchell points out the important fact that in Spain alone this revival took place, since only there was the Renaissance accomplished without any violent break with the chivalrous, heroic spirit of the Middle Ages.

In her first chapter, Miss Patchell examines the background and circumstances of the Spanish originals and of their translator (and his hacks) as well as of the reading public. 'By sophisticated and cultured readers . . . they were coldly received' (p. 20), but evidence shows that theatre audiences knew the romances, that *Palmerin* was the 'bourgeois ideal of chivalry', that they were the 'favourite reading of ladies' maids'. This chapter ends with a note on the appeal of romances of chivalry for 'the antiquarians of the Romantic Revival. . . . *Palmerin of England* seems to have been their favourite' (p. 23). This cycle was not the only one to be translated into English; but Miss Patchell offers no explanation of Munday's particular choice. Perhaps the pretension of one of the *Palmerin* continuations to be an English chronicle was thought to have a sales value. It was the first translated.

There follows a close analysis of the themes and motifs of these *Palmerin* novels. They have a strong medieval flavour: the ideals of valour and honour and the atmosphere of magic and enchantment that Cervantes satirized are paramount. Undoubtedly, the use of magic was excessive in sixteenth-century romances: it reflects a Renaissance preoccupation, present all over western

Europe, but very strong in Spain, which it would be interesting to trace in its literary reflections.

A separate chapter, entirely justified by the importance of the theme, deals with the treatment of love. 'It is this consistent deprecation of adulterous love and the substitution for it of marriage as a romantic ideal that constitute the most significant divergence of the Spanish romance of chivalry from the code of *amour courtois*.' This is perfectly true and is to be seen also in the Byzantine novel of Spain in the same period, and is characteristic of Cervantes. Miss Patchell further observes:

This broad interpretation of marriage contained in the Spanish books results in a lenient attitude towards illegitimacy. . . . This attitude, no doubt, derives from actual social conditions which Spanish law permitted. During the Middle Ages, when so many Christians were dying in the wars with the Moslems, there was established in Spain the system of *Barraganeria*, or legalized concubinage, as a means of keeping up the population. Under this system birth out of wedlock was accounted no disgrace. Even as late as 1889 the Spanish civil code declared that natural children, that is, those born of unmarried parents who at the time of conception were free to marry, were legitimized by the subsequent marriage of the parents and entitled to the same rights as legitimate children.

Miss Patchell's explanation is not a completely convincing solution. The presence of the Moslems on Spanish soil and the prolonged war against them were profoundly disturbing to the Spanish people both by greatly retarding the ordering of society out of the anarchic chaos of the Visigothic period and by the influence of the totally different Moslem system of marriage and family institutions. The question was precisely one in which successive medieval legislation is seen (despite the need of increasing the population) endeavouring to strengthen the family. Indeed, the stress on morality of the Renaissance novel reflects the final but tardy triumph of these endeavours. *Barraganeria* was graded according as it came nearer to genuine monogamic marriage. It is hardly true to say that 'birth out of wedlock was accounted no disgrace'; although certain categories of illegitimate children could inherit in certain proportions of the estate, this was never to the full extent that legitimate children did so, and only in the upper ranks of society. In Castile, by the thirteenth century, this was no longer the case. The reference to the Civil Code indicates simply the provision of Catholic Canon Law, and is not peculiar to Spain, where it still obtains (as it also has always done in Scotland). The penchant for making the knights illegitimate is connected with another aspect of Spanish psychology, the stress on achieving personal worth against odds, *hacerse valer*. The hero of this type of romance is the earliest anticipation in literature of the self-made man, who literally does make himself out of, as nearly as it is possible to get to it, nothing.

Miss Patchell's last chapter, while interesting, is rather unsatisfying. She describes some dozen works of the Elizabethan period, but the examination is not systematic enough, and the influence of the Spanish tradition is not brought out clearly. A rather disproportionate amount of space, for example, is devoted to refuting the view of an unpublished prize essay that Sidney drew largely on the *Amadis* for his *Arcadia*. One would have welcomed either a general study of

the influence of Spanish chivalric romance on Elizabethan literature, with an estimate of what proportion could be traced specifically to the Palmerin cycle as translated by Munday, or else a more circumscribed study of imitations of the latter. As it is, Miss Patchell's discussion is presented in a general way as warranting 'the conclusion that the Spanish romances of chivalry had a considerably more extended influence than has perhaps been realized'. Some useful summaries follow. The book offers a great deal of useful information on what is undoubtedly a very tedious yet important aspect of comparative literature.

E. SARMIENTO

English Literary Criticism: The Renaissance. By J. W. H. ATKINS. Pp. xi+371. London: Methuen & Co., 1947. 16s. net.

What we are to expect from Professor Atkins as historian of criticism is by now well known—full measure, pressed down but not exactly running over, for the historian's control of phase and sequence is too firm. The present study outdoes its predecessors in the art of packing. It finds space not only for summaries lightened by copious citation from the Elizabethan word but for proportioned reference to numerous minor, but not insignificant, figures. Among these I was particularly glad to note the interesting but little-known Richard Willis (*De re poetica*, 1573).

For the Renaissance, as for antiquity and the medieval phase, Professor Atkins follows the road of 'straight' history. One cannot say that English Renaissance criticism has been neglected, but it has been singularly slow in finding its just perspective. To have given this perspective must be held the major accomplishment of this book. Continuity and change, successive or competing phases and groups have been made to stand out with a new, and not forced, clarity. It may be hoped that we shall meet henceforward with fewer easy generalizations about 'the Renaissance', 'the Elizabethan', &c. The inclusion of Milton as critic in the same volume with Ascham, Sidney, and Ben Jonson abundantly justifies itself.

Spingarn did his work so well that all the 'classicizing' business of the Kinds and Unities and the massed 'influence' of the Italian 'Aristotelians'—Minturno, Castelvetro, and their kind—have tended to prejudice the modern approach. That the *Apologie for Poetrie* is, naturally and rightly, the most familiar Elizabethan critical document has inevitably reinforced this prejudgement. It is a fact that younger students show themselves still obsessed by all this. Professor Atkins has moved on to his present subject from the comparative freedom, even waywardness, of the medieval phase and is conditioned to note not only the 'continuity' which generally rewards the historian's search, but the natural cleavages and the spontaneous adjustments of mixed traditions to practical needs and national temper.

The main lines of what is modestly claimed to be 'in some sense' a new approach are set out in the Preface and Conclusion. Towards the close of the former, recollection (presumably) of the shadow of sixteenth-century 'Aristotelianism' induces a deeper note of diffidence; the writer seems to anticipate a criticism that 'too much attention has been devoted to rhetorical studies, too little to

the influence of the Italian sixteenth-century critics'. As to the first, Professor Atkins can, I think, be assured that there is certainly not a word too much; as to the second, it emerges convincingly from his narrative that, where Italian leadership counted, it was that of the fifteenth-century humanists, not (apart from Sidney) that of their successors.

Where such variety of material is dealt with in moderate compass there will necessarily be occasions when the (always grateful) reader would like a few words more, where he will be conscious of slight doubts or wish to argue a point. It would be interesting to discuss the reasons for the slight influence of the Italian Aristotelians: was it time-lag or their formal and theoretical character? There is no mention of Ramist influence. I am less assured than Professor Atkins that our sixteenth century in general had cleared itself of the medieval confusions between rhetoric and poetic, I think he underrates the popular effectiveness of the manuals of schemes and tropes, and I cannot agree with the implied values of the summary description of *Astrophel and Stella* ('... fanciful and unreal') and (to a much less extent) of his analysis of Bacon on Poetry ('... wishful thinking'). Professor Atkins's style has always been subordinated to the over-riding purpose of compendious information; in this book the compression has become positively heroic. The use of formulas of transition and enumeration and of mechanical inversions for the sake of 'variety' is notably on the increase. But all such cavils are of trivial importance seen against the range and solidity of the material. Certainly this reviewer, acknowledging a threefold debt and venturing to hope that an 'Augustan' volume is already being designed, would not wish to raise any murmur that might even momentarily put Professor Atkins off his stroke.

G. D. WILLCOCK

The Epigram in the English Renaissance. By HOYT HOPEWELL HUDSON. Pp. x+178. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1947; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$2.50; 14s. net.

Professor Hudson was engaged at the time of his death in 1944 on three books: a volume of Poems, since published under the title *Celebration*; a treatise on Education, *Educating Liberally*, of which a fragment has been printed by the Stanford University Press; and a third book, *The Epigram in the English Renaissance*, of which the volume under review is all that remains—three chapters and a part of a fourth. The surviving chapters constitute, it is conjectured, 'less than a quarter of the book that the author had intended'. On p. 9 the author refers the reader to 'Chapter XVII', which was to have brought the history of the epigram 'down to its modern development in prose'. What we have lost can only be guessed—and the editors give us here no help. What survives takes us no farther than the Latin epigram of the sixteenth century. I suppose that the book, if finished, would have treated also English epigram. How far it would have carried the history of it, at what point the author supposed the English 'Renaissance' to end, nothing indicates.

As delivered, this is a book for classical scholars. But perhaps they must not be too scholarly. It makes, if they are not, a delightful anthology. An exacting

scholar will deprecate here and there errors due some of them to mere carelessness, others to an imperfect feeling for Latin. To mere carelessness I would attribute *carmen gratulorum* (for *gratulatorium*, p. 41), *Populis Consentiens* (for *Populus*, p. 45), *In Episcopum Illiteratim* (for *Illiteratum*, p. 48), *Nicharchus* (for *Nicarchus*, p. 57, twice, and in the Index), *Dunstallus* (for *Tunstallus*, p. 92—but this may reproduce the original text), *calves* (for *claves*, p. 108), *Nulla domus* (for *Nulla*, p. 121). On p. 169, I do not know what stood in the text which Professor Hudson transcribes, but his

Poena tolli potest, Culpa perennis erit

is a mere error for *Poena potest tolli*, &c. For the faulty Greek accents on pp. 26 and 28 I am ready to put the blame on the printer. More serious are occasional errors of translation. The most notable of these is in a rendering of some Latin verses of More, where More translates an English original. The verses are interesting because even Professor Hudson's learning has not availed to trace the original. More's Latin is worth giving here, in the hope that some reader of the *R.E.S.* may happen upon his English source:

O cor triste malis misere immersumque profundis
 Rumpere: sit poenae terminus iste tuae.
 Sanguinolenta tuae dominae tua vulnera pande,
 Illa brevi est, quae nos dividet una duos.
 Quam miser ergo diu sic heu lachrymabo, querarque:
 Mors ades, et tantis horrida solve malis.

The fourth line is only made difficult by the comma before the relative *quae*, which in modern printing would be omitted. The comma omitted, the meaning is plain enough: 'It is she, and she alone [my mistress], who will shortly divide us [who will swiftly cleave in two the poet and his heart].' But Professor Hudson renders: 'That (i.e. life?) is short which separates us two'; a rendering impossible to a competent Latinist (*illa quae* rendered as though it were *illud quod*, *brevi* as though *brevis*, and the future tense *dividet* taken as all one with *dividit*). Now and again Professor Hudson creates difficulties which do not exist, and removes them by expedients plainly inadmissible. Wyatt died in 1542: and Parkhurst wrote his Epitaph; of which Professor Hudson gives the fifth line thus:

Flent Pylo, Charites, novem sorores.

Pylo, the Graces, and the nine sister-Muses weep for him. But who is Pylo? 'Pylo', says Professor Hudson, 'seems to be Nestor.' 'The form', he adds, 'should be *Pylos* or *Pylus*.' It should, in fact, be *Pylios* or *Pylus* and the first syllable, though Professor Hudson does not say so, should be long, and is short. And what has Nestor to do with the Graces and Muses and the poets—Nestor, that proverb for the prosy? Pondering *Pylo*, it occurred to me to wonder whether the true correction might not, perhaps, be *Pytho*. Wyatt, like Apollo, might seem to have some interest for *Pytho*. But I was wasting my time—or Professor Hudson was wasting it for me. Going to the original text, I found that Parkhurst, in fact, wrote *Pytho*. *Pylo* is merely a false transcription by Professor Hudson.

On pp. 146-7 Professor Hudson tries his hand on some schoolboy Latin of

William Paston. He propounds an emendation—*dico* for *di*—which could convince nobody. He renders a subjunctive, *videas*, as though it was the indicative *vides*. He refers the reader to the Bohn edition (1849) of the Paston Letters. If he had looked at the standard edition, Gairdner's edition of 1904 (vi. 942, p. 8), he would have seen that his *di* is a misreading of the manuscript, which has *dicitur* (represented by a contraction). He would have found, further, that the *Quare* which he prints is a misreading of the manuscript *Quaeritur*.

Most of Professor Hudson's renderings from the Latin, let me add, are a degree free and loose. The familiar distich of Erasmus (for the image of the child Jesus in St. Paul's School)—

Discite me primum, pueri, atque effingite puris
Moribus; inde pias addite literulas

is ill rendered when *effingite* (i.e. *effingite me*) *puris moribus* is Englished by 'attain to pure manners' (p. 29).

Some of these blemishes would, no doubt, have disappeared if the author had lived to see his book through the press. They are not, in any case, worth fretting over unduly in a book both good and readable. The book begins with a chapter on 'The Nature of the Epigram'. The *O.E.D.* defines the verse epigram as 'A short poem ending in a witty or ingenious turn of thought, to which the rest of the composition is intended to lead up'. After 'turn of thought' Professor Hudson suggests the insertion of the words 'or sententious comment'; and this is helpful. The *O.E.D.* credits Leland with the first use of the word 'epigram'. Thanks to Professor Hudson we can now say that it was first used by Wyatt, in a book (1528) of which the only known copy is in the Huntington Library. Chapter II is devoted wholly to the epigrams of More. It is worth recalling, though Professor Hudson misses it, that when, about the middle of the sixteenth century, Lilio Gyraldo surveyed the field of English poetry, the great names in it, for him, and perhaps for Italians generally, were Chaucer and Wyatt, More and Lily. More certainly deserves a chapter to himself—Professor Hudson's chapter is excellent. Lily is reserved for Chapter III—'Scholarly Epigrammatists after More'. With Constable, Leland, Parkhurst, Haddon, and Buchanan—all felicitously anthologized—he makes the longest chapter in the book the best. Lily, Leland, and Buchanan are names sufficiently familiar; the two first, however, familiar to most of us in other connexions than those of poetry. For the account of Parkhurst I feel particularly indebted to Professor Hudson. Parkhurst belonged to a college which I supposed myself to know well, a college that has bred poets of repute—Grimald, Jasper Heywood, Massinger, Carew, Hartley Coleridge, Lang, Gerald Gould, Blunden, T. S. Eliot. But to the Merton poets whom I knew I must now add Parkhurst, who became a Fellow (not, as Professor Hudson says, a tutor) of that college in 1530. The unfinished Chapter IV—'The Epigram in Schools and Colleges' is as good, and readable, as Chapter III. It will be read with particular interest by Wykehamists and New College men. I have never studied the type of verse called 'Protean'. 'The most famous Protean line in literature', says Professor Hudson, is

Tot tibi sunt dotes, Virgo, quot sidera caelo.

Of this 'monostich in honour of the Virgin Mary', we learn, '1022 arrangements can be made without impairing either sense or metre'. But the author of it, a French Jesuit, Bernard Bauhuys, could, when he wished, do better. Of another of his Protean verses—

Rex, Dux, Sol, Lex, Lux, Fons, Spes, Pax, Mons, Petra, Christus—

he could make (he alleged) 3,628,800 arrangements.

Let some mathematician play with this. Here, meanwhile, for the classical scholar, and for all the friends of 'Latin verse', is a book well worth having, a book full of fresh and entertaining learning.

H. W. GARROD

Fletcher, Beaumont and Company. Entertainers to the Jacobean Gentry. By LAWRENCE B. WALLIS. Pp. xiii+315. New York: King's Crown Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. \$375; 21s. net.

Baroque Literature in England. By MARCO MINCOFF. Pp. 71. (Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Faculté Historico-Philologique, Tome XLIII.) Sofia: Imprimerie de l'Université, 1947. [No price stated.]

These studies exemplify the typical American and continental European approaches to seventeenth-century drama. Dr. Wallis is anxious for the rehabilitation of Fletcher and his collaborators: he traces the decline in their reputation from the time of the 1647 Folio to recent years and urges that Fletcher's high degree of technical mastery has been insufficiently appreciated during the past three centuries. He is ready to admit the superficiality of mind displayed by the dramatists, but writes on the defensive, feeling that his charges have been unfairly singled out for reproof. Much that he says is illuminating, as, for example, when he analyses the quarrel scene between Amintor and Melantius in *The Maid's Tragedy* and demonstrates the careful patterning in the emotional responses aroused in different parts of the scene. But his pleading hardly convinces when he speaks of 'the thrill of tragic horror when the wounded Amoret is thrown into the well' (p. 194): we may recognize the proficiency of *The Faithful Shepherdess*, and find the play socially significant and historically influential, but Dr. Wallis should not expect us to mind what happens to Amoret. There is a similar over-strenuousness in the attempt to relate the Beaumont and Fletcher dramatic method to that of the 'comical satires' and other plays around 1600. Fletcher may have learned something from Marston in the juxtaposing of contrasted figures, but it is odd to read of *The Maid's Tragedy*: 'The King's relationship to Evadne was doubtless suggested by Claudius' to Gertrude' (p. 167).

Dr. Wallis holds that after Fletcher had failed to win success with *The Faithful Shepherdess* and Beaumont had been similarly disappointed with *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* they realized that even the private-theatre audience of the time needed somewhat coarser fare. *Philaster*, the first-fruit of their collaboration, derived its popularity from its 'emotional patterning' and its avoidance of both allegoric symmetry and sophisticated burlesque. There can be no doubt that this play was important, but Dr. Wallis's judgement of Fletcher's skill would be more likely to command sympathetic attention if he were readier to see that the

playwright's success in the fabrication of trivialities made his influence the more harmful. The tragedies of Davenant and Shirley and lesser men owe much to him, and are the worse for it. In Caroline days comedy was the sprightlier for Fletcher's lead, but only the melancholy Ford and the phlegmatic Massinger could make anything of tragedy.

Dr. Mincoff's paper is part of a study of Beaumont and Fletcher which is promised for future publication. He is here concerned with contrasting the 'Renaissance' and 'Baroque' styles in English literature, architecture, pictorial design, &c., with a view to presenting the Beaumont and Fletcher plays as the starting-point of English dramatic baroque. It would never occur to him to plead in defence of the plays he is discussing: they are to him nothing more or less than materials for historical study. He distinguishes between three different phases of Elizabethan literature, seeing in what he calls the 'revolt' characteristics which are neither 'Renaissance' nor 'Baroque'. This 'revolt' was 'the movement of opposition to the Petrarchian and romantic idealism of Spenser's generation', and its writers include Donne, Jonson, Marston, Webster, Middleton, and the later Shakespeare. This, indeed, might suggest that an attempt to impose the usual continental categories on Elizabethan literature is inevitably unsatisfactory: too much of the first-rate matter is *sui generis*. Nevertheless, Dr. Mincoff's survey of late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century styles sharpens our perception of Fletcher's kinship with Dryden.

His attempt to see Elizabethan and Stuart drama in a series of compartments leads him to some judgements on individual writers and plays which will not win universal acceptance. Arguing that sixteenth-century writers were medieval rather than classical, he overlooks the Senecan influence in tragedy and calls Gabriel Harvey a 'pedantic exception' (p. 7). He says, of *Romeo and Juliet*: 'scene succeeds scene as a separate unit, each treated for its own sake regardless of the total effect' (p. 18); but some readers may feel that Shakespeare had made his total effect depend very largely on the deliberate contrasting of juxtaposed scenes. It is strange, too, to find *The Spanish Tragedy* called 'amorphous in structure' (p. 45). However, disputable judgements like these are almost inevitable in the kind of broad survey that Dr. Mincoff is here engaged in. His study of Beaumont and Fletcher is likely to be valuable.

CLIFFORD LEECH

Paradise Regained: The Tradition and the Poem. By ELIZABETH MARIE POPE. Pp. xvi + 135. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1947. \$2.25 net.

Paradise Lost and the Seventeenth Century Reader. By B. RAJAN. Pp. 171. London: Chatto & Windus, 1947. 10s. 6d. net.

Paradise Lost and Its Critics. By A. J. A. WALDOCK. Pp. viii + 150. Cambridge: University Press, 1947. 8s. 6d. net.

These three books represent two different approaches to Milton's poetry which it is of interest to examine. Miss Pope and Mr. Rajan wish to put the poetry securely back into the seventeenth century as a means of ensuring right judgements; Professor Waldox attempts to reverse this whole trend of recent Milton

criticism. Miss Pope's is a learned study of the intellectual milieu of *Paradise Regained* that is likely to remain a standard book on its subject. She assumes as her starting-point that Milton and his public were equally familiar with the traditional views on Christ's temptation in the wilderness, since this was matter of current instruction and interest. In handling this subject 'Milton was rather in the position of a medieval poet writing a romance of courtly love or a modern author a novel about abnormal psychology: his subject was already defined in the terms of highly important technical studies well known to his audience. In criticising works of this type, it is always safest to begin where the writer himself begins—with the results of the technical studies.' There can be few, if any, of these technical questions involved in the poem which Miss Pope has not investigated. It is impossible within the limits of a review to go into the intricacies of even the major topics she discusses—the discrepancies between the three Gospel narratives and the different methods of resolving them; what she terms 'the triple equation' (the analogy established between the temptations of Adam and Eve, of Christ, and of this life) with all its exegetical diversity; the detailed interpretations of the three temptations of Christ and of their relationship to each other. It is of course possible to understand *Paradise Regained* without such specialist knowledge: if it were not self-sufficient it would not be a good poem. Yet how many readers do in fact get on with the poem? And is not the common failure to appreciate the poem due partly to ignorance of much that the poet takes for granted, partly to the substitution of modern conventions of thought for those the poet is working with? One of the chief benefits of Miss Pope's book should be that it will save us from regarding as heretical and peculiar to Milton much that the seventeenth-century reader would have taken as conventional and orthodox, and so enable us to read the work as a poem rather than as a piece of Miltonic egotism. One of the important points, for instance, that emerges from Miss Pope's studies is that Milton's Jesus would not strike the seventeenth-century reader as unorthodox. Since the discovery of *The Christian Doctrine* it has become the habit of critics to say that Milton's Arianism appears in his insistence on Christ's humanity. But Milton's contemporaries would not have found anything heretical in this insistence on Christ's humanity, any more than his eighteenth-century commentators did; for it is catholic doctrine that when Christ became man to redeem the world it was necessary for Him to suffer and triumph in His human nature. Christ came as the Second Adam; and most Protestant theologians held that during the Temptation the logic of the case required that Christ's divine nature should be in abeyance. It was also generally agreed that Satan's chief object was to discover whether Jesus was indeed the Son of God: 'If thou be the Son of God' is the formula in two of the temptations. If Satan succeeds in forcing Jesus to manifest His divine nature he will have accomplished all his purposes: he will have settled the question of His identity, made Him betray the cause of humanity by falling back on His divine powers, and seduced Him into an act of faithlessness in doing the Devil's bidding. The contest centres therefore on this question of the mystery of Christ's nature. Milton accepts this as a main motive in Christ's duel with Satan; and all Christ says and does, until the final dramatic revelation, is determined by the need

to baffle Satan's efforts to break through His human defences. The inevitable defect, as critics complain, is that Milton's Christ appears too negative, cool, and detached; this, it is said, is not the Jesus of the Gospels nor the Redeemer of the world. He demolishes Satan's arguments and specious fabrics, but offers no inspiring visions in their place. The effect is most apparent in the central Temptation of the Kingdoms. Christ concentrates on the fallaciousness of the worldly power and glory Satan offers; He does not attempt to depict the true kingdom He will establish, although He does define true glory and kingship in an abstract and impersonal way. When, for instance, Satan suggests His seeking power and influence through popularity, Christ replies contemptuously that the people are 'a miscellaneous rabble . . . Of whom to be disprais'd were no small praise'; we are offered no vision of a people redeemed by His truth. Christ does indeed declare to Satan the coming of His kingdom, and then curtly adds,

Means there shall be to this, but what the means
Is not for thee to know, nor me to tell.

The fact is, as Miss Pope points out, that 'the manner of the Saviour's reign was so inextricably bound up with the mystery of his real nature that Christ could not very well discuss the one without revealing the other'. Miss Pope nevertheless thinks that the resulting portrait is 'so little in harmony with Christ's character as a whole that a writer more conscious of the personality of Jesus might have avoided it at all costs'. Most critics find it a portrait made in Milton's own image (would that someone might slay this bugbear of Milton criticism!). There are two points to be made in mitigation of these criticisms: first, that Milton is working dramatically, making Jesus act and speak within the conceived situation; secondly, that sternness is a side of Jesus's character the sentimentalist misses, and that in a duel with the Devil one might expect this side to be to the front.

Both Mr. Rajan and Professor Waldock approach the problems of *Paradise Lost* under the searchlight of the criticism of the last thirty years; Mr. Rajan in particular appears to have read most of the mass of specialist studies produced in America during this period, and he is more deferential to his predecessors than Professor Waldock. The chief difference between them is that whereas both appeal to the common reader, Waldock's is the common reader of to-day and Rajan's of Milton's day. Like Miss Pope, Rajan imagines his seventeenth-century reader as 'not impossibly learned' but as familiar through the ordinary channels of intercourse with the sources of the doctrines of *Paradise Lost*—the Bible, the system of divinity (with its secular applications), the conceptions of hierarchy, order, and degree. Above all, as he says, we must realize that the dogma of the Fall would be unquestioningly accepted by Milton's first readers, and its elaborations would be known to them. The function of an epic is to express the mind of the age, and the epic poet must work with doctrines to which the times assent. The strength of Rajan's book comes from the quotations by which he establishes that the ideas and beliefs embodied in *Paradise Lost* were endemic to the time. He treats the poem as a poem of ideas; but he insists that they are the ideas Milton shared with his age, not ideas peculiar to himself. He also insists

that they are ideas so expressed as to become part of the poetic tissue, and are thus not capable of being known or judged outside the poem. He warns us in particular against using *The Christian Doctrine* as a commentary on the poetic statement of doctrine in *Paradise Lost*. The poet uses ideas as he uses words, aware of their history, of their current significance, and above all of their relations within the poetic context; and his use of them is an event in their history. We need to make ourselves familiar, as Milton's contemporaries were familiar, with the doctrines out of which he creates his poem; yet it is not the doctrines as stated elsewhere by himself or others with which we have to do as readers of *Paradise Lost*, but the doctrines as transmuted into a particular pattern of poetic experience. In the end 'there is nothing we can rely on except the poetry. The text is there, and our immediate business as critics is to find out what the text meant to a seventeenth century reader.' These principles as set forth in Rajan's opening chapter are finely devised and expressed. It is all the more disappointing to find him going on to treat *Paradise Lost* as belonging to the literary tradition of the hexameron, and not at all as belonging to the tradition of the classical epic: 'There is now no doubt (thanks to American research which is too often ignored) that *Paradise Lost* in its major outlines, and to a surprising extent in its detail and imagery, follows what is known as the hexameral genre.' This view leads him in the end, 'against his better knowledge', into examining the poem too much, like any other hexameron, as versified theology. It is difficult to see how one can appreciate the poetic transmutation of ideas in *Paradise Lost* unless one approaches it as a poem in the form of the classical epic.

Professor Waldock thinks that the business of the critic is to find out what the text of *Paradise Lost* means to the not impossibly learned modern reader:

If we are ever to see the poem as it really is, our impressions, surely, are what we must first and last attend to . . . they constitute the facts of the poem. Between the impression of natural, easygoing, unprejudiced readers there is, I believe, no great variation. Differences mount with sophistication—because the registering mind, so to say, comes to know too much. What happens is that our unforced sense of what is occurring is often complicated (and very naturally) by our sense of what Milton expects us to think is occurring. We know what he expects, partly from the information we bring to the poem, partly from the prods and reminders that Milton administers to us within it. In the upshot our reception of a given passage can be, and often is, a blend of two things: what we have really read in the passage, and what we know Milton is wishing us to read into it. But unless the two are kept distinct, and unless, in particular, we recognise that within the passage itself presentation and commentary may clash, we can make little headway, it seems to me, towards the truth about *Paradise Lost*.

There are thus for Waldock two sides to the poem, and they do not fit: there is the story and there is the theological interpretation of the story. The fact is, he tells us, Milton did not foresee the difficulties inherent in the story as he proposed to tell it, because he lacked the special literary experience for assessing such narrative problems. 'The classical epic, it is true, was behind him, but that was not enough'; what he wanted was the novel, which enables us to 'assess at once the practicability of certain themes for literary treatment'. Such remarks may

appear naïve but they are a serious statement of Waldock's approach to the poem: *Paradise Lost*, he implies, should be judged as we would judge a tale of everyday humanity in a modern novel, not as the fable of an epic embodying the faith of an age. He denies in effect what Rajan contends, that the ideas are an integral part of the action. Rajan, as I have indicated, does not seem to me to show how this is effected when he comes to the examination of the poem itself. In his interpretation of the ninth book, for instance, he relies too much on such statements as that 'Eve sins because her faculty of reason is deceived, Adam by surrendering will to passion', and that these two faults make up a compendium of every possible error. These and other such observations are true, but they convey little enough of the texture of the poetry, its colour and sentiment, and quick human drama; he does not show the ideas in action. It is against such analyses that Waldock protests. These, he would say, may be the things the poet expects us to think and feel, but let us attend rather to what his telling of the story actually makes us think and feel. The poem is a story or it is nothing; let us follow the story, being careful to discriminate between that and the poet's official comment.

We can see the results of Waldock's methods in his central chapters, dealing with the Fall. He begins with the temptation of Eve, and gives the best appreciation I have read of this masterpiece of narration. Because there is so much changeable drama in this scene and the motives of Eve's conduct are so various, Waldock thinks the poet could not have been concerned, like modern commentators, with the special reasons for her fall and the theological implications. The truth is of course that this scene is stuffed full of theology; but since to Waldock's sense the scene enacts itself without theological interference he is able to go along with his author. But the fall of Adam is different; and here Waldock parts company with his author. In the poem Adam is condemned for yielding to the blandishments of Eve—call it excess of passion, sensuality, gregariousness, uxoriousness or what you will; yet, in the story as Milton tells it, Adam acts from the worthiest motive, from true unselfish love, 'love as human beings know it at its best'. The poem at this critical point asks from us two incompatible responses, approval and disapproval of Adam's action: 'the story cannot take the strain at its centre, it breaks there, the theme is too much for it.' When, however, we turn to the text we find it is Waldock's theory that will not take the strain: the text is too much for it.

Waldock rightly begins his examination of Adam's fall with the last conversation between Adam and Raphael, since Milton is here laying down principles 'to serve as a foundation for what ensues'. If Waldock's reading of this episode is true, his reading of the fall is true. The episode begins with Adam rhapsodizing on his nuptials, from which he passes to an expression of wonder at the strange, disturbing power of woman's beauty. His senses find delight in all around him, but only in the presence of Eve does he feel such delight as overcomes him:

here passion first I felt,
Commotion strange, in all enjoyments else
Superiour and unmov'd, here only weak
Against the charm of Beauties powerful glance.

He wonders at this failure or reversal of Nature; for he knows that Nature intends woman for his inferior, as being inferior 'in the mind and inward Faculties':

yet when I approach
Her loveliness, so absolute she seems
And in herself compleat, so well to know
Her own, that what she wills to do or say
Seems wisest, vertuous, discreetest, best;
All higher knowledge in her presence falls
Degraded. . . .

Waldock calls Adam's speech a curious mixture: 'At one moment he merely mouths his author's theories of woman's place and function. . . . At another, his tribute is so deep and moving that one can hardly relate it to the tone with which he seemed to begin.' But surely the progression of thought is natural, and a clear revelation of Adam's state of mind. Adam begins by marvelling at the excessive power of sexual love, seemingly beyond reason and nature; he ends by acknowledging the effect it creates of Eve's intellectual and moral superiority—a glorious expression of romantic love, which Professor Waldock approves but Raphael does not. Raphael admonishes Adam not to yield to this illusion of passion, coolly pointing out its basis in sex. Waldock finds Raphael's reply dishonest, 'unpleasant and untruthful'. Raphael, he complains, ignores all that Adam says in the latter part of his speech and assumes that there is no more in question than sexual attraction; and he concludes by explaining 'wherein true love consists' as though Adam had not already done this. Adam 'half-a basht' (Waldock thinks 'there is no reason why he should be', though it seems natural enough in a lover whose raptures have met with such a reception) ventures on a reply, says Waldock, 'that makes doubly clear what he has already made clear':

Neither her outside form'd so fair, nor aught
In procreation common to all kinds . . .
So much delights me as those graceful acts,
Those thousand decencies that daily flow
From all her words and actions mixt with Love
And sweet compliance, which declare unfeign'd
Union of Mind, or in us both one Soule;
Harmonie to behold in wedded pair
More grateful then harmonious sound to the eare.
Yet these subject not

'May not one fairly suggest', asks Waldock, 'that a man who speaks like this is already passing Raphael's tests tolerably well?' Certainly Adam thinks so. Yet, although Adam denies that he is in subjection to the feelings he has disclosed, Raphael discerns the weakness that will bring about his fall. He is not of course yet guilty of the sin of sensuality, but Raphael is diagnosing his state of mind and warning him against its dangers. What Raphael sees is Adam's adoration of Eve, how sensuality is mingled with that adoration, and how if that adoration prevails so will sensuality. Adoration—idolatry: this is the sin Adam has confessed

himself prone to. And so Raphael's last word is that the harmony of wedded love will hold only so long as Adam loves this side idolatry:

Be strong, live happie, and love, but first of all
Him whom to love is to obey.

Love God first and the joy of human love will be secured. This, in Milton's view, is 'love as human beings know it at its best'. By taking sides against the poet Waldox not only misses the dialectical exposition of Milton's theory of sexual love but misses the human truth of the scene in which it is embodied. How can we judge such a scene as story—which is how Waldox pretends to judge—unless we first read it from the poet's point of view, accepting his criticism of life until we see whether it has been realized in action? Waldox, favouring a different theory of sexual love, complains that the episode does not represent his theory; he does not begin to consider whether it successfully represents the poet's. The attitude to woman which, as expressed by Adam, Waldox calls on us to approve, was general enough in the life and poetry of Milton's time. Milton condemned it, yet has expressed it in a manner not surpassed in the long history of the poetry of courtly love; just as in Satan's temptation of Eve he has surpassed contemporary poets in his use of the sentiments and devices of the 'metaphysical' poetry that belongs to this same tradition. There is no undramatic restraint in his unfolding of Adam's thoughts and feelings; Adam is left to speak out of a full heart, even to the point of persuading readers that he is in the right—just as Satan is left free to persuade us, if we like, of his true heroism. It is proof of Milton's strength of genius that he can so let himself go, and yet remain 'like Teneriff or Atlas unremov'd'. This ability to enter into 'the wily subtleties and refluxes of man's thoughts' without being deluded, to enter 'the very lime-twigs of his spells, and yet come off', is the mark of the highest dramatic talent. It should also be our warrant for listening attentively to his every word: that Milton's Adam speaks so well, with such human warmth and conviction, is surely the best reason for presuming that his other spokesman, Raphael, is no fool.

Waldox's interpretation of the climax of the poem follows from his interpretation of this preparatory scene. When Adam hears 'the fatal Trespass don by Eve' he at once decides that he is involved in her ruin:

And mee with thee hath ruind, for with thee
Certain my resolution is to Die;
How can I live without thee, how forgoe
Thy sweet Converse and Love so dearly joyn'd . . .

Adam, refusing to forsake Eve in her extremity, falls, says Waldox, 'through love . . . through true love, through the kind of love that Raphael has told Adam

is the scale
By which to heav'nly Love thou maist ascend'.

Certainly Adam falls through love, but not the kind of love Raphael commends.

Waldock's confidence, however, that he understands these things better than the poet enables him to deal roundly with Milton's conclusion:

So saying, she embrac'd him, and for joy
Tenderly wept, much won that he his Love
Had so enobl'd, as of choice to incur
Divine displeasure for her sake, or Death.
In recompence (for such compliance bad
Such recompence best merits) from the bough
She gave him of that fair enticing Fruit
With liberal hand: he scrupl'd not to eat
Against his better knowledge, not deceav'd,
But fondly overcome with Femal charm.

'Fondly overcome with Femal charm' is simply Milton's comment [comments Waldock], on the recent course of events: events the true nature of which he has just been demonstrating to us. And between a comment and a demonstration there can never be real question, surely, which has the higher validity. 'Femal charm' is merely Milton's way of inciting us to take a certain view of a matter that he has already presented with a quite different emphasis and to a quite different effect. What the comment really means is that Milton has begun to realize, if vaguely, that his material has been getting out of hand. . . . Adam's words ring so true that they *prove* to us his feelings, and against proof of that kind no comment can—or ought to—prevail. . . . Milton is by no means always alive to the precise effect that his narrative is making and to the exact way in which parts of it interlock with other parts. . . . What [Milton] does is to yield himself, at the critical moments, to the full imaginative promptings of his subject. The treatment of the fall of Adam . . . is a noble and generous treatment. . . . Only, there is the thesis in the background; he cannot forever neglect it; hence 'Femal charm'.

What one likes most about Waldock's criticism is that he says plainly what many think but only insinuate, and that he courageously draws all the deductions. We see where we are, and it is possible to give straight answers. As to comment and demonstration, what if the comment is part of the demonstration, as is proper in narrative poetry? The lines in question are dramatic comment on the immediate situation; but they are more than that, they are the summing up of the whole 'argument' that began with the conversation between Raphael and Adam at the end of the eighth book. We understand them if we have understood that previous passage. The poet has not swerved from his course. He has seen the situation steadily and clearly even whilst living and pleading as Adam; he keeps control and brings us firmly at the end to his own predestined conclusion. What do Adam's words prove beyond his feelings? Waldock thinks they prove that Milton has been carried away by his deep unconscious sympathies; once again, as in the previous episode, the poet's irrepressible humanity has betrayed him into a sympathy with Adam that founders his conscious intentions. I must say I find it more sensible to assume that the poet knew what he was about. Supposing he had not let Adam speak as he felt, in a way that warms our hearts, even in a way to which there now seems no honourable alternative: where would have been the force of the story, where the moral? It is necessary that we should feel to the full Adam's predicament, that we should feel his action to be 'inevitable', before

the poet comes down with that stern and measured judgement, 'he scrupl'd not to eat'. These lines do hurt our susceptibilities—Waldock is right there; they shock us as Aeneas's desertion of Dido shocks us. Epic poets have a habit of shocking us by setting our pitiable human passions against a terrifying background of the divine. If we are to get along with them we must bring something more than our modern appetite for 'human drama'; they will give us that, but in a manner we may not have bargained for.

B. A. WRIGHT

The Nonsense of Common-Sense 1737-1738. By LADY MARY WORTLEY MONTAGU. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by ROBERT HALSBAND. Pp. xxx+57 (Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities 17). Evanston: Northwestern University, 1947. \$3.00.

The arresting title which Lady Mary chose for these periodical papers encourages the optimistic reader to believe that he will be treated to a display of wit, paradox, and possibly scandal. Unfortunately, he is quickly aware that it announces no more than her intention to refute the opinions circulated by *Common-Sense*, the opposition paper which, brilliantly conducted by Lord Chesterfield and George Lyttelton, waged an effective campaign against Sir Robert Walpole. This is a disappointment. There is nothing so unentertaining as political journalism. It is possible to snatch a pleasure from obituaries, sale records, and plantation news, but the tedious, trivial arguments about rival foreign and domestic policies, which daily engrossed and wasted so much of the eighteenth century's literary energy, are peculiarly barren of entertainment. These nine papers, which Mr. Halsband proves for the first time to have been written by Lady Mary, do not succeed in being better than other contemporary party journals, but they are interesting and important because they invite further consideration of their remarkable authoress's character and ability.

Mr. Halsband in his thorough Introduction shows how Lady Mary might have been attracted into political journalism. Lord Hervey was her friend and ally; Maria Skerratt, Sir Robert Walpole's second wife, was numbered among her 'amies choisies'; and they may have prompted her to defend Walpole's policy, with which she was in sympathy. The first number of *The Nonsense of Common-Sense* appeared on 16 December 1737, and the ninth and last on 14 March 1738. Each number carried this casual announcement: 'To be continued as long as the Author thinks fit, and the Publick likes it.' Although a few of the essays were reprinted in the *London* and the *Gentleman's Magazines*, *Common-Sense* did not even condescend to notice its opponent, and it cannot have considered the challenge to be at all serious. The short run which the paper enjoyed proves that the public was uninterested in its message, and that Lady Mary quickly lost interest in her venture. This is hardly surprising. Unless a journalist believes in a political cause, or is wedded to it by self-interest, political controversy must seem to him to be rather a dirty game which it is impossible to take seriously; but if he does not treat it seriously, his writing will lack that appearance of passionate sincerity and that virulence without which converts will never be

made or enemies routed. Lady Mary, by temperament a dilettante, was prevented by her sex from engaging directly in politics, and her amateur papers lacked the qualities and knowledge which were essential to their success. She was impotent to deflect the professional diatribes of men like the authors of *Common-Sense*, who were familiar with every trick and rule of the game. She wrote gracefully, she commented wittily and satirically upon society, she reflected lightly upon morality, and she advanced the cause of feminism, but her papers were as useless as gossamers to stop a storm. Mr. Halsband has lucidly annotated these papers which, as he rightly claims, display 'entirely new facets in' Lady Mary's 'character as a writer and thinker'.

DOUGLAS GRANT

The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth. Miscellaneous Sonnets, Memorials of Various Tours, Poems dedicated to National Independence and Liberty, The Egyptian Maid, the River Duddon Series, The White Doe and other Narrative Poems, Ecclesiastical Sonnets. Edited from the manuscripts with textual and critical notes by E. DE SELINCOURT and HELEN DARBISHIRE. Pp. xxiv + 596. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946. 25s. net.

To praise this fine edition would be impertinent at this time of day. How fine it is is well known, and in what ways. It is a great satisfaction to learn the connexions between poem and poem in the great multitude of them, connexions of date, and subject, and what-not—to be told, for instance when we find Wordsworth alluding to John Dyer, where else he alluded to him and what his views on him were. Wordsworth, like a good shepherd, knew all his sheep, though there were thousands of them, and knew them all as individuals, though he was not always sure which particular fold—that of fancy, imagination, the affections, and so on—he wanted some of them finally gathered into. Few readers, few students, few enthusiasts even, will find life long enough to give them anything like Wordsworth's intimate knowledge of all the poems, but when anybody becomes interested in any particular selection he can now conveniently get to know all he needs to about its items. In particular he can now know the textual history of the poems, their often long textual history. He can enter into the labours, that is, of de Selincourt, labours which it has now fallen to the lot of Miss Darbishire to complete. She has been a friend to the edition from the start, and, much as it suffers for us all sentimentally in having its first mover withdrawn from it, it suffers little, we must believe, as a thing of scholarship. At his death de Selincourt left the present volume, and the two which are still to follow, 'substantially ready for publication'. Miss Darbishire, therefore, figures as the editor of Wordsworth's editor. An editor whose task is mainly, no doubt, one of 'passing' what she finds before her. But not entirely that: for example, it is she who has discovered the manuscript of an unpublished sonnet translating one of Milton's Italian ones (see pp. v and 577).

The crown of this edition is its textual apparatus. Wordsworth's available poetry was voluminous before de Selincourt got to work, but it is appreciably more voluminous now, not only because of the printing of the first version of *The Prelude* complete with its variants, but because of all that is printed for the

first time in this edition. The present volume rescues pieces from periodicals (pieces which Wordsworth never reprinted), and rescues earlier versions of sonnets long well known, and prints pieces for the first time.

We are grateful for all this. But it is perhaps the bulk of the new scraps that makes our gratitude enthusiastic. Wordsworth is not a poet like Milton or Pope or Gray whose every word, even in a discarded passage, blooms with meaning. A few variants, therefore, from his manuscripts and early editions, if that is all the apparatus provided, might excite us little more than, say, a newly discovered poem or two of Thomson's (I recall that when on one occasion I announced to R. W. Chambers that I had found one such lost thing, he remarked with laughing impatience: 'Haven't we enough of Thomson already?'). If we are as grateful for Wordsworth's discarded scraps as we should be for scraps discarded by poets who always wrote with a rich conciseness, that is because the scraps discarded by Wordsworth exist in their generous thousands. From among the thousands some of the scraps, even at first glance, are seen as valuable. I select the following as samples of what struck me as that:

1. The last line of the sonnet 'On approaching the Staub-Bach' reads in the final version (1837):

This bold, this bright, this sky-born, WATERFALL!

The reading of the manuscript is:

This bold, this pure, this sparkling . . .

and that of the editions of 1822-32:

This bold, this pure, this sky-born . . .

(I reconstruct the readings from the apparatus). It is a beautiful instance of progressive improvement.

2. The final text of the famous sonnet 'Nuns fret not . . .' gives us those supreme lines:

bees that soar for bloom,
High as the highest Peak of Furness-fells,
Will murmur by the hour in foxglove bells.

The earliest extant version, one in manuscript, reads:

Bees that one flight would take from Bath to Wells
Will murmur. . . .

The final version retains the same root meaning, but rejects the wit which reminds us of Browning for something better still because more immediately and undistractingly to the point. A bee seen in Bath is not a bee seen as having travelled far: a bee seen on a mountain top startles us, in our ignorance, as a stranger. And we experience accordingly the emotion of having a piece of presumptuous ignorance dispelled: the bee puts us in our place. To say this is merely to begin, and do no more than begin, to analyse all that exists in the later reading. What exists there is more obvious now that the earlier reading has drawn our attention to it afresh.

3. One sonnet opens:

There is a little unpretending Rill
Of limpid water, humbler far than aught . . .

To confine ourselves to the manuscripts one of them gives us:

Tis six miles from our dwelling-place; no rill
Rivulet, or brook, or fount, or well, nor aught . . .

And another:

There is a homely water neither rill
Nor spring enclosed in sculptured stone nor aught . . .

which is corrected to

There is a tiny water neither rill
Motionless well or running fount, nor aught . . .

The poet is found bobbing up to attack the possibilities again and again.

4. On p. 490 we are reminded that six lines now found in the 'Musings near Aquapendente' were originally part of 'Michael'. (We are not surprised by this: never did a traveller leave so little of his native haunts behind him.)

I said above that this edition will give anyone all he needs to know about any poem he becomes interested in. But there is one obvious exception to this sweeping praise. Among all the collected and digested facts set out clearly in the 'critical notes' there is an obvious deficiency of facts about Wordsworth's debt to eighteenth-century poetry, poetry which we know to have been as thoroughly in his blood as any earlier poetry and, indeed, as any rock or stone or tree. Wherever Wordsworth borrows from poetry earlier than the eighteenth century, the editors say so (so far as I myself can judge). Particularly where he borrows from Milton's. On this track their eyes are those of eagles: for example, p. 506 furnishes this note:

sinuous lapse] a combination of two Miltonic phrases: 'sinuous trace' of . . . snakes . . . and 'liquid lapse of murmuring streams' . . .

That note presents the sort of material we ought to find plentifully in all editions of poetry. It shows us the poet's mind at a deep level. But such notes should not be at the mercy of what for this purpose is casual reading. If so, the proportions are all awry. The editors have read widely, of course, in eighteenth-century poetry, but apparently not recently, apparently not for the purpose of becoming better editors of Wordsworth. A casual reading of sixty pages of text discovers echoes such as these, echoes not remarked on:

- (1) . . . [she] can hear
Another's praise from envy clear. (p. 187, l. 12 f.)

Wordsworth is drawing the character of a woman, and remembers Pope's 'Of the Characters of Women':

She, who can love a Sister's charms, or hear
Sighs for a daughter with unwounded ear.

- (2) The striking expression 'golden views' (p. 195, l. 53) is from *An Essay on Man*, ii. 269.

- (3) Lines 10-12 on p. 199: cf. Goldsmith's *Deserted Village*:

And tell of all I felt and all I saw;

- (4) 'moist marge' (p. 246, l. 6) is from Collins's 'Ode on . . . Popular Superstitions . . .':

(5) The sonnet (on p. 250) about the rustic lovers' fooling with each other while they cross the stepping-stones is an odd one coming from Wordsworth; it is the kind of thing we expect from Thomas Hardy, especially from Thomas Hardy the novelist. This odd sonnet ends with the couplet:

The frolic Loves, who, from yon high rock, see
The struggle, clap their wings for victory!

This is odd, too, coming from Wordsworth, and odd in a different way. It is characteristic of him to end his poem with a broadening-out of the sense, putting the subject into a sudden long perspective, but this particular perspective is a surprising one for Wordsworth to have been aware of. He is not often found borrowing from the machinery of the epic, but here he goes farther and borrows from the machinery of the mock-epic. *The Rape of the Lock* at v. 53 f. reads:

Triumphant *Umbriel* on a Sconce's Height
Clapt his glad Wings, and sate to view the Fight.

A final word. The separate volumes of this edition have been given indexes of titles and first lines. It is to be hoped that the last volume will be given general indexes to cover the text and notes as well as the titles and first lines.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON

Wordsworthian Criticism: A Guide and Bibliography. By JAMES VENABLE LOGAN. Pp. xii+304. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1947. [No price given.]

Of the making of books there is happily (in spite of paper shortage) no end, and indeed, so much has been admirably thought and said about everything that it is now becoming necessary to have, not only books about books and criticisms of criticism, but compendiums of both. Jeffrey would have rubbed his eyes if, after writing 'This will never do', he could have had sight of this Proteus rising from the sea; the glimpse, one may surmise, would not have made him less forlorn. Professor Logan's bibliography of Wordsworthian criticism, which numbers 661 items, reminds us that Wordsworth has never ceased to invite attention, and that he has, moreover, claimed the interest of many first-rate minds. There is in his work, life, and thought so much that is complex and enigmatic, so much that is central in all discussion on the nature and uses of poetry, and so much that raises fascinating philosophical, psychological, and aesthetic issues, that a history of Wordsworthian criticism almost inevitably becomes a history of nineteenth and twentieth century culture in general. Mr. Logan has rendered a genuine service in giving us, not only the aforesaid bibliography, but also a historical guide to the changing interests of successive generations of critics. Did Wordsworth overstate or mis-state his own case in the *Preface*? Was

his ethical teaching as complete and systematic as Bishop Butler's? Was he an apostate and Lost Leader? Did the poet in him die comparatively young, and if so, was it due to respectability, isolation, or eye-trouble? Was Annette an abiding or a transitory disturbance? Was Wordsworth a Hartleian 'sensationalist' or a Platonic mystic, or both? and if both, how did he pass from one state to the other? What was it that he saw when his vision was clearest? How far does he communicate this vision, and how far merely discuss it in metrical language? Most of what has been said (mainly in England and America) on these and many other themes will be found faithfully summarized in Part I of this book. Mr. Logan has not set out to offer another interpretation of his own; it has been his sufficient task to trace the course of Wordsworthian criticism, though he occasionally hints a fault or an incompleteness, and often usefully stresses what is specially important. The task, one feels, fully deserved the care and scholarship he has lavished upon it, and one rises from the book with a sharpened sense of Wordsworth's greatness, of his significance as a symbol and embodiment of the eighteenth-to-nineteenth-century transition, and of his continuing relevance for us to-day.

BASIL WILLEY

The Language of Tragedy. By MOODY E. PRIOR. Pp. ix+411. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. \$5.00; 27s. 6d. net.

Professor Prior explores the relationship between 'language poetically used' and that dramatic action which, relying for his definitions on the *Poetics*, he calls the soul of tragedy and the 'primary formal principle of a serious play'. He seeks to discover what special functions are performed by verse in the tragic drama, and whether it can, and should, be employed in plays written for the modern theatre. His method, which is certainly the most suitable for his purpose, is that of detailed critical examination of plays selected from four main periods. He considers at some length the Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, the heroic tragedy of the Restoration, certain plays by major nineteenth-century poets, and modern verse drama from Stephen Phillips to Stephen Spender. His wide survey concludes with the invigorating judgement that enough good verse plays have been written in the twentieth century to justify the hope of a renaissance in the poetic drama.

The book contains many admirable and stimulating critiques of individual plays. In each case the author's object is to discover whether or not the play's language is integrally related to the action; whether it has utilized to the full

the capacity of language imaginatively to suggest analogies, establish consistent and complementary schemes of imagery and bring to bear on the specific action of the play a complex and extended body of association to give magnitude and generality to the immediate circumstances of the action (p. 301).

Although Mr. Prior nowhere loses sight of his main theme the sections which deal with groups of plays by a single dramatist often amount to more or less com-

plete critical evaluations of the dramatist's work: such are the sections, full of discernment, on Byron (pp. 244 ff.), on Browning (pp. 272 ff.), and on Yeats (pp. 326 ff.).

It might be objected that Mr. Prior is too much influenced in his critical approach by the search for 'consistent and complementary schemes of imagery', and that he condemns plays which lack such schemes, but which are bad drama and bad poetry for quite other reasons—reasons such as Jonson had in mind when he said: 'Wheresoever, manners, and fashions are corrupted, Language is. It imitates the publicke riot.' This corruption, rather than the difficulty of creating an organic relationship between diction and action, would seem to be the primary problem of the modern poetic dramatist. The chapter on the Elizabethan tragedy is a dexterous treatment of a complex subject, made more complex by the fact that many other critics have used methods similar to Mr. Prior's and have reached conclusions not widely divergent from his own. One cannot be quite satisfied that the establishment of a chain of 'animal images' or of a contrast between 'sun images' and 'night images' in any particular play necessarily indicates that the play is one in which poetic language and the 'probabilities and necessities of the action' have been co-ordinated. We need to understand more clearly both what an image is and what the Elizabethans understood the nature and function of figurative language to be before we can safely extend this critical method not only to the 'dynamic relations which function in the dramatic action' (p. 384) but to the study of the Restoration and Romantic drama as well.

The effectiveness of the book might have been increased if room had been found for a final chapter of retrospect and summary.

PETER URE

SHORT NOTICES

Characterization in Chaucer's Knight's Tale. By ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT; **Foreign Influences on Middle English.** By H. T. PRICE. Pp. 23, 45 (The University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, Nos. 5, 10, April 1947). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. \$.50; \$.75.

In the first of these two attractively produced pamphlets, Marckwardt attempts to prove, by dexterous comparisons between passages in the Knight's Tale and Boccaccio's *Teseide*, that the characterization by Fairchild and Root of Palamon as the contemplative and Arcite as the active man is incorrect, and that such labels would be more correct reversed. The second pamphlet is a by-product of the great Middle English Dictionary now in preparation at the University of Michigan, and is based upon the material for the letter A. The author assembles some of this material to show that there is a remarkable parallelism between the use of prepositions and adverbs in Middle English on the one hand, and in Old French, Old Norse, and Medieval Latin on the other, that in some cases the Middle English usage has been taken over from a foreign language, and that in other cases the existing English idiom has been strengthened and enriched by the foreign idiom. Price states his case cautiously, as befits a good lexicographer, but on the whole convincingly. One would recommend close attention particularly to his treatment of ME. *at*. Curiously enough, he does not mention anywhere Sir William Craigie's *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, the material in which should reinforce some of his arguments.

A. MACDONALD

Tudor Theories of History Writing. By LEONARD F. DEAN. Pp. 24. (The University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, No. 1: April 1947.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1947. \$50.

Mr. Dean examines theories of historiography propounded by certain scholars of the Renaissance period. Such are Patrizzi and Concio, whose ideas were embodied in Thomas Blundeville's *True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories* (1574); Jean Bodin, whose *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem* (1566) was translated by Thomas Heywood as the preface to his English version of Sallust (1608); Simon Grynaeus, whose *De utilitate legendae historiae* (1531) was widely read in the sixteenth century and translated early in the seventeenth; and Sir Walter Raleigh. Mr. Dean's failure to distinguish clearly between theory and practice in historiography makes his argument at times difficult to follow. Certainly, his conclusion 'that Tudor histories should be read in part at least as poetic interpretations of human behavior' is one that would have been vigorously repudiated by almost all the practising historians of the period. Hobbes's views on history are hardly relevant to the subject of Tudor history; but much that is both relevant and valuable could have been gleaned from the works of Polydore Vergil, Hall, and Stow, to name only three authors whose names do not appear in this essay. Study of the works of these and other Tudor historians might lead Mr. Dean to question the validity (at least for England) of a clear-cut distinction between 'medievalist' and 'humanist' and might suggest some amplification of his summary of 'the conservative or conventional Tudor theory of History'.

MAY MCKISACK

An Autobiography. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. With an Introduction by MICHAEL SADLEIR. (The World's Classics 239.) London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. 3s. 6d. net.

Readers of this journal will not need to be reminded of Dr. R. W. Chapman's excursion into the textual criticism of Trollope's *Autobiography* (R.E.S., vol. xvii, 1941, pp. 90-4). His emendations showed that any future edition must be based on a more careful reading of the manuscript than the original printer had undertaken. For that edition we are still waiting: we shall expect it not only to correct the errors in the existing text but to restore the passages which Henry Trollope deleted, notably the account in ch. 13 of Trollope's squabble with Charles Reade. In the meanwhile the Oxford University Press has provided us with the next best thing. The World's Classics reprint of 1923 has been reissued with corrections confined to the sixteen corrupt passages emended by Dr. Chapman in this journal and the further eleven passages emended by him in *Notes and Queries*. An index has been added, but not a critical apparatus; and Mr. Sadleir has taken the opportunity to revise his introduction, and to add to it the text of a letter from Trollope to his son relating to the manuscript, and some observations on the Stebbins's *The Trollopes: the Chronicle of a Writing Family* (1945).

J. B.

Tennyson's Two Brothers. By HAROLD NICOLSON. Pp. 35. (The Leslie Stephen Lecture, 1947.) Cambridge: University Press, 1947. 1s. 6d. net.

Frederick and Charles Tennyson (-Turner) are an apt choice for a lecture by their brother's biographer, and the lecture is equally good as an introduction to and a reminder of their now too much neglected work. Mr. Nicolson's known faculty for vivid characterization is applied, and he does some critical service to Charles's sonnets by his appreciation and quotation. He claims also the purpose of using this 'triple confrontation' to show the greater Tennyson 'from an unaccustomed angle'. But he does not add much to the essay by (Sir) Charles Tennyson in Hallam Tennyson's *Tennyson and his Friends* (1911), which

(with Fitzgerald's letters and W. H. Rawnsley's *Memories*) must be the main source of our (and his) knowledge of the other two brothers. That writer said succinctly of Frederick and Charles, 'They represent two extremes of the Tennyson temperament, the mean and perfection of which is found in Alfred'. Of course one can trace in the three signs of their common heredity (the 'black blood' of 'all the Tennysons') and early environment. But Tennyson has not simply all this and genius too; he is a different *kind* of poet. Mr. Nicolson (to whom he is 'that sensitive mystic') allows too little, perhaps, for the 'catholic sympathy with modern life' which contemporaries praised and which is so notably lacking in his more recluse brothers.

The blend of sympathy and amused detachment must have made Mr. Nicolson's lecture delightful to hear. Especially in his anecdotes. He adds, from family tradition, a picturesque detail to the story (which has in fact been printed, by Mrs. Sellar, and probably elsewhere) of 'I am Septimus, the most morbid of all the Tennysons'. But the story of 'my own poetry at five years old', also quoted as hearsay, reads better in Hallam Tennyson's *Memoir* (ii. 93).

K. T.

The Colloquial Element in English Poetry. By C. DAY LEWIS. Pp. 32.

(Robert Spence Watson Memorial Lecture for 1947.) Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Literary and Philosophical Society, 1947. 2s. net.

'Poetic diction', as Mr. Day Lewis says at the beginning of this lecture, is a 'dry biscuit of a word' and 'hungry generations of scholastic weevils have battened on it'. His lucid, urbane, sensitive discourse places before the reader no worm-eaten biscuit, but the wholesome bread of plain, supple, conversational speech which has been the medium of so much good English poetry since the fourteenth century. He finds a series of pendulum swings towards 'the formal esoteric ideal of poetic diction' in the Romance poets, the early Elizabethan lyricists, Dryden, the Augustans and the Pre-Raphaelites, and a series of movements in the other direction, towards 'a looser, rougher, more supple, more prosaic idiom', in Chaucer, the Elizabethan dramatists, the metaphysical poets, Wordsworth and the Romantics, Hardy and the Georgians. His argument is illustrated by a masterly examination of the diction of poems by Drayton, Donne, Wordsworth, Byron and Browning. In an illuminating digression, he 'jumps three hundred years' to compare Donne's conversational manner built on a dialectic with a similar quality of speech in the work of Robert Frost exemplified by his fine lyric 'Mowing'.

Perhaps the most original and significant part of Mr. Day Lewis's analysis is to be found in the extremely subtle and suggestive distinctions which he draws between various kinds of colloquial and simple diction from Donne's dramatic intensity to the conversational satire of Byron, Clough and MacNeice, the 'desperate simplicity' of Wordsworth and the 'hybrid' of pure lyric and colloquial statement in Browning and Hardy.

At the end of the lecture, the poet-critic steps down from his rostrum of impartiality and frankly admits his personal preference for 'the intimate personal idiom', for Hardy's Lizbie Brown as compared with Tennyson's opulent Maud whom he admires 'at a distance'.

V. DE S. P.

Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap. Edited for *Nyfilologiska Sällskapet*, Stockholm, by E. WELLANDER, M. EKMÄN, and A. GABRIELSON. Vols. xv and xvi. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1943, 1946. 7 Swedish Kr. a volume.

This periodical covers a wide range of modern topics, but two articles in vol. xv deal with medieval subjects: Gunnar Tilander's 'Fragment d'un traité de fauconnerie anglo-normand en vers' (26-44) is an edition of an Anglo-Norman treatise on hawking from MS. Harley 978, ff. 116 b-117 a; and Emrik Slettengren's 'On the Development of OE.

initial *sc*' (45-50) bases its argument mainly on the evidence of alliteration. Gösta Langenfelt has two articles on modern English topics. In '-y in Billy etc.' (xv. 67-92) he agrees with Sundén that the hypocoristic -y in English had a Scottish origin. He suggests that the hypocoristic sense was due to the assumption that certain Scottish names ending in -y were diminutives whereas, in fact, the -y derived from a Gaelic genitive. In 'The Roots of the Propword *one*' (xvi. 97-138) he traces OE. *an* through Middle and Modern English, and derives its use as a propword from the adjectival and pronominal usages of a period earlier than the fifteenth century. H. W. Donner, in a long, interpretative article 'On the Utopia of St. Thomas More' (xv. 93-200), refers to St. Thomas More's other works, the sources and contemporary conditions. He finds the first book mainly satirical, and considers that the whole work should be regarded as a fable rather than an ideal.

P. GRADON

Studia Linguistica. Revue de linguistique générale et comparée.

Edited by BERTIL MALMBERG and STIG WIKANDER. Vol. i, no. 1. Lund: Gleerup; Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard, 1947. 10 Swedish Kr. a volume.

This periodical is devoted to general and comparative linguistics. In 'Arbitraire et nécessaire en linguistique' (5-10) Pierre Naert works up to his view that individual concepts can exist without corresponding linguistic expression. He suggests that the term 'signe', which implies a referent, should be abandoned for 'signème', parallel to, and (for monophematic words) coincident with, 'phoneme'. Nils Kjellman, in 'Die Übersetzung der griechischen Verbalkomposita mit *eis* in der gotischen Bibel' (45-51), draws a parallel between the syntax of Gothic and of modern Swedish and German. In the Gothic Bible the translation of verbs compounded with *eis* appears to him to be systematic: where the Greek uses such a verb, with or without a following preposition, the Gothic verb is mostly compounded with *inn*. When, however, the compound verb in Greek is followed or preceded by the preposition the Gothic verb tends to be simple. Since the same system is apparent in German and Swedish translations of the Bible the author concludes that it represents a genuine linguistic tendency.

Contributions to this periodical (in English, German, French, or Spanish) should be sent to Docent Bertil Malmberg, Televägen 9, Lund, Sweden.

P. G.

American Speech. A Quarterly of Linguistic Usage. Edited by WILLIAM C. GREET. Vol. xxii, no. 2. New York: Columbia University Press, April 1947. \$4.00 a year.

American Speech contains some philological and historical articles (C. J. Lovell, 'The Background of Mark Twain's Vocabulary', 88-98; R. A. Hall, Jr., 'Anglo-Romance Etymologies', 99-103; L. Pound, 'The American Dialect of Charles Dickens', 124-30), but its most valuable material is lexicographical. J. I. Riordan ('Some "G.I. Alphabet Soup"', 108-14) discusses the significance of American army slang for the study of semantics. J. W. Arnold's 'The Language of Delinquent Boys' (120-3) is a similar type of article, on reformatory slang.

P. G.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

ELH

Vol. 15, No. 2, June 1948

On the characterisation of Beowulf (Henry Bosley Woolf), pp. 85-92.

[Ll. 1-498.]

The salvation of Lear (Oscar James Campbell), pp. 93-109.

James Thomson's *Seasons*: shifts in the treatment of popular subject matter (Horace E. Hamilton), pp. 110-21.

Anstey and anapestic satire in the late eighteenth century (Martin S. Day), pp. 122-46.

From surrealism to 'The Apocalypse': a development in twentieth century irrationalism (Frederick J. Hoffmann), pp. 147-65.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. 11, No. 3, May 1948

Sir Thomas Elyot and the translation of prose (James Wortham), pp. 219-40.

The origins of the 'moral sense' (Ernest Tuveson), pp. 241-59.

[A study of Thomas Burnet's pamphlets on Locke's *Human Understanding*.]

Vol. 11, No. 4, August 1948

The Puritan preacher's contribution to fiction (Kathrine Kroller), pp. 321-40.

Robert Burton's economic and political views (William R. Mueller), pp. 341-59.

Humour in the age of Pope (Edward N. Hooker), pp. 361-85.

Randall Hutchins *Of Specters* (ca. 1593), translated from the Latin (Virgil B. Heltzel and Clyde Murley), pp. 407-29.

A letter from Edmund Waller to Thomas Hobbes (Paul H. Hardacre), pp. 431-8.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. 43, No. 2, April 1948

Anglo-Danish literary relations 1867-1900. The fortunes of English literature in Denmark (Brian W. Downs), pp. 145-74.

A source of the *Confessio Amantis* (Lewis Thorpe), pp. 175-81.

['The False Bachelor' and *Marques de Rome*.]

Donne's Spanish authors (Evelyn M. Simpson), pp. 182-6.

Benlowes and Milton (Harold Jenkins), pp. 186-95.

A Spenser note (W. J. B. Owen), pp. 239-41.

[The 'Letter to Raleigh'.]

An uncollected letter from Wordsworth to Crofton Croker (W. T. Bandy), p. 242.

[Refusing to contribute to a periodical; 1827.]

Vol. 43, No. 3, July 1948

John Donne and the 'Via Media' (H. J. C. Grierson), pp. 305-14.

Joseph Hall's imitation of Juvenal (Arnold Stein), pp. 315-22.

- Henry VIII in Shakespeare and Calderón (A. A. Parker), pp. 327-52.
 Chaucer: a criticism and a reply (Bernard F. Huppé), pp. 393-9.
 [Margaret Galway, 'Chaucer's Sovereign Lady', *MLR*, vol. 35, pp. 145-99. Reply from Miss Galway, pp. 399-400.]
 'Robene and Makyne' (Arthur K. Moore), pp. 401-3.
 A modern fable of Æsop (Percy Simpson), pp. 403-5.
 [Poetaster, III. iv. See *MLR*, vol. 41, pp. 173-9.]
 Plato and Milton (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 409-10.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. 193, No. 16, 7 August 1948

- Milton's 'two-handed engine' yet once more (E. S. Fussell), pp. 338-9.
 [Possible allusion to Donne?]
 Milton's chariot of paternal deity (Kester Svendsen), p. 339.
 Burnet's *Grumbler* and Ambrose Philips (Nicholas T. Joost, Jr.), pp. 340-2.

Vol. 193, No. 17, 21 August 1948

- Pericles*, II. v (Kenneth Muir), p. 362.
 Smollett and the translation of the *Don Quixote*: important unpublished letters (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 363-4.
 [See further, *N. & Q.* 4 September, pp. 383-4.]
 Fielding and *Shamela* (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 364-5.
 [Parallel with *Amelia*.]
 'The Eccentrics' (F. C. Clare), p. 365.
 [Thackeray a member of this club, 1846.]

Vol. 193, No. 18, 4 September 1948

- Kirke White (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 386-7.
 [Religious reflections in MS. note.]

Vol. 193, No. 19, 18 September 1948

- The identity of Mavortio in Tourneur's *Transformed Metamorphosis* (J. D. Peter), pp. 408-12.
 [Henry VIII?]

Vol. 193, No. 20, 2 October 1948

- Webster and Raleigh (D. P. V. Akrigg), pp. 427-8.
 The ascription of 'A Sorrowful Ditty' to Smollett affirmed (Francesco Cordasco), p. 428.
 J. P. Browne's edition of Smollett's works (*idem*), pp. 428-9.
 Some Wordsworthian borrowings (W. J. B. Owen), pp. 429-30.
 A source for Wordsworth's sonnet 'At Rome' (Charles Norton Coe), p. 430.
 [In Burnet's *Travels*.]
 T. S. Eliot and Sherlock Holmes (Grover Smith), pp. 431-2.
 [Murder in the Cathedral and 'The Musgrave Ritual'.]

Vol. 193, No. 21, 16 October 1948

- 'Rugby Chapel' and *Jane Eyre* (Kathleen Tillotson), pp. 453-4.
 A phrase in Webster (D. P. V. Akrigg), p. 454.
 [Duchess of Malfi, IV. ii. 362.]

Vol. 193, No. 22, 30 October 1948

- The Dryden-Swift relationship (P. D. Mundy), pp. 470-4.
 Byrhtferth's hexameters (L. Whitbread), p. 476.
 Jane Austen and Charlotte M. Yonge (M. Hope Dodds), pp. 476-8.
 The long-lost death mask of John Keats (J. T. Preston), pp. 478, 483.
 [Description of copy in writer's possession.]

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. 27, No. 1, January 1948

- The rebel angel in later poetry (E. N. S. Thompson), pp. 1-16.
 [Hugo, Santayana, and others; also prose—Anatole France, C. S. Lewis.]
 Satan's serenade (Howard Schultz), pp. 17-26.
 Further background for *The Jew of Malta* and *The Massacre at Paris* (Thomas P. Harrison, Jr.), pp. 52-6.
 On Longfellow's translation of a Michael Angelo sonnet (Creighton Gilbert), pp. 57-62.
 The Middle Ages and the late eighteenth century historians (Herbert Weisinger), pp. 63-79.
 A note on Vergil and *The Battle of the Books* (A. Sanford Limouze), pp. 85-9.
 La belle dame as vampire (Edwin R. Clapp), pp. 89-92.
 [On Keats's poem.]
 The three souls again (William Peery), pp. 92-4.
 [Use of the doctrine by Elyot, Sir John Davies, and others. See *P.Q.*, vol. 25, pp. 382-3.]
 Horace Greeley reviews *Omo* (Menton L. Williams), pp. 94-6.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. 63, Supplement, Part 2, 1947

- American bibliography for 1947, pp. 1-135.
 [English language and literature, compiled by Albert C. Baugh and others, pp. 20-74; American literature, compiled by Lewis Leary, pp. 74-88.]
 Research in progress in the modern languages and literatures (William R. Parker and Robert G. Sawyer, editors), pp. 137-405.

Vol. 63, No. 3, September 1948

- The besieged ladies in Arthurian romance (Helaine Newstead), pp. 803-30.
 'If shadows be a picture's excellence': an experiment in critical bibliography (Edwin Wolf 2nd), pp. 831-58.
 [Study of textual transmission with seventeenth-century poem, probably by Walton Poole, as example.]
 Edward Bysshe and the poet's handbook (A. Dwight Culler), pp. 858-86.
 Addison's *Campaign* and Macaulay (Robert D. Horn), pp. 887-902.
 Was Sir Richard Steele a freemason? (Rae Blanchard), pp. 903-17.
 The chronology of the Waverley Novels: the evidence of the manuscripts (Robert D. Mayo), pp. 935-49.
 The planet-tempest passage in 'Epipsychidion' (Kenneth Neill Cameron), pp. 950-72.
 Dickens and the psychology of dreams (Warrington Winters), pp. 984-1006.

Impact of French naturalism on American critical opinion 1887-1892 (William C. Frierson and Herbert Edwards), pp. 1007-16.

The influence of London on *The Dynasts* (George Witter Sherman), pp. 1017-28.

STUDIES IN ENGLISH

Vol. 27, No. 1, June 1948

Anonymity vs. signature in Victorian reviewing (Oscar Maurer, Jr.), pp. 1-27.

Correspondence of Harriet Beecher Stowe and Elizabeth Barrett Browning (Hazel Harrod), pp. 28-34.

[Includes text of letter from Mrs. Stowe on spiritualism, November 1860.]

The literary background of renaissance poisons (Thomas P. Harrison, Jr.), pp. 35-67.

William Jerdan, editor and literary agent (Harry Ransom), pp. 68-74.

Unpublished letters of Charles Brockden Brown and W. W. Wilkins (David Lee Clark), pp. 75-107.

[Includes text of letters, mainly of 1792-3.]

Beattie's 'The castle of scepticism': an unpublished allegory against Hume, Voltaire, and Hobbes (Ernest Campbell Mossner), pp. 108-45.

[Includes text.]

An early Byron MS. in the Pierpont Morgan library—'The Edinburgh ladies' petition' (Guy Steffan), pp. 146-76.

[Includes text; 1807.]

Keats and nature (Edleen Begg), pp. 177-84.

Malory in the *Connecticut Yankee* (Robert H. Witson), pp. 185-206.

Porcia's curiosity: a tale thrice told by Shakespeare (Robert Adger Law), pp. 207-14.

The role of Douglas in *Henry IV, Part One* (Seymour V. Connor), pp. 215-21.

The prayer for the Queen in *Roister Doister* (William Peery), pp. 222-33.

Dryden and the authorship of the epilogue to Crowne's *Calisto* (William Bradford Gardner), pp. 234-8.

Lazamon in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Rudolph Willard), pp. 239-78.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. 48, No. 3, July 1948

John Gower and the last years of Edward III (Gardiner Stilwell), pp. 454-71.

Unpublished fragments by Shelley and Mary (Frederick L. Jones), pp. 472-6.

[Includes texts of Shelley fragments; 'On the Christian religion' and 'On the game laws'.]

Keats, empathy, and 'the poetical character' (Newell F. Ford), pp. 477-90.

George Henry Lewes as a critic of the novel (Morris Greenhut), pp. 491-511.

The geography of Poe's 'Dream-land' and 'Ulalume' (J. O. Bailey), pp. 512-23.

V
2
5
1
9
7

A
R

4
S

U